

A
Seasonable ANTIDOTE

AGAINST

APOSTASY.

CONTAINING

I. Some plain PROPOSITIONS, recommended to the serious Consideration of all those who may be under any Temptation to forsake the Church of *England*, and revolt to that of *Rome*.

II. A Paper, pretended to be an ANSWER to the foregoing Propositions. And

III. REMARKS, at large, upon the said pretended Answer, by the Author of the Propositions.

With a PREFACE, shewing the special Reasons and Occasion of making the same public.

per Lindsay

“ Let the Emissaries of Rome boast ever so much, as if theirs were the Mother and Mistress of all the Christian Churches; or that the Doctrines, now taught in it, were the true Old Religion, without Addition or Alteration; or that their Pope is the Supreme Head and Infallible Judge of all; (not to enlarge here, by an Enumeration of many other controverted Points;) it requires little more, than an honest Heart and unprejudiced Judgment, in any one, to be clearly convinced, That, to forsake the Church of England, and join with that of Rome, is far from being the safe Way to Salvation.”
LOND. EVEN. POST, Aug. 9, 1757.

L O N D O N:

Printed by T. GARDNER, opposite St. Clement's Church in the Strand, for the Author.

M,DCC,LVIII.

8
4th
1

4



P R E F A C E.

WHOEVER engageth in Controversy ought to be well persuaded, at least in his own Mind, that his Cause is just; and as well prepared also to stand firm against the various Remarks and Censures which may be expected from Opponents. And therefore, as I was personally concerned (without any of my own seeking) in what here follows, I could not be wanting in Duty to the Church, my Mother, to offer my Mite towards her Service, (small as it is!) trusting in Divine Providence for Assistance and Success in so good a Cause, and encouraging myself in the Prosecution of it, by the Remembrance of a wise Axiom of St. Gregory the Great, that Nothing is more safe to be defended than Honesty, nothing more easy to be spoken than Truth.

Now, the Occasion of what follows was this: A young Man (for whom I had entertain'd a very good Opinion and friendly Regard) after having, for some Time, with great Decency and Devotion, frequented the Divine Service of the Church of England, in a Congregation where it is my Duty to officiate, came to me, seemingly full of Trouble in Mind, through religious Scruples,

iv P R E F A C E.

conceived (as he told me) by the Perusal of a Book or two, which he shew'd me, and professing much Sorrow, for that he had already made some too hasty Advances towards Communion with the Church of Rome, without previous Consultation.

I soon perceived, that his Curiosity had led him into Conversation with some of those subtle Agents, who compass Sea and Land to make Profelytes; and that their Artifices and Insinuations had made some Impression upon him. But, hoping that he was yet so free from Prejudices, as not to be past Recovery, I pointed to several of the erroneous Principles contain'd in those Books; and shew'd him, that they were made up of stale Objections, and groundless Cavils, new-vamp'd, which had been, over and over, detected and disprov'd, in the Popish Controversy. After which, considering that the several controverted Points of Doctrine would require more Time (at least) than he was Master of, to examine with due Attention, I thought it the best and shortest Way for us both, to strike at the Root of the Controversy; which, being once shaken, might render it needless to go through the Inquiry after the particular Branches.

With this View I drew up, and gave him in Writing, the FIVE PROPOSITIONS, which are hereunto subjoin'd; promising, that if these were previously adjusted, and could be fairly disprov'd, I would be ready to enter into the more particular Points in Controversy, by way of Reply.

P R E F A C E.

At length I received from him the Paper here following, inclosed in a short Letter, dated Friday, 23 Sept. But, without waiting to see what I was preparing in Reply, he soon sent me a Letter, in the very Words here following :

‘ REV. SIR,

‘ I Have taken this Opportunity of returning
‘ my sincere Thanks for all the Trouble I
‘ have given you : But, after the most serious
‘ Consideration, I must own that I believe the
‘ Roman Catholick to be the ancient and true
‘ Church of Christ. And I am fully con-
‘ vinced, that they teach nothing repugnant to
‘ the Word of God. For I have examined
‘ every Article of their Faith with the greatest
‘ Strictness, and find every one of their Proofs
‘ in my own Bible. So that I shall no longer
‘ doubt of this or t’other Article of Faith be-
‘ cause I can’t comprehend it ; for I am afraid
‘ it would in Time make me disbelieve the
‘ Whole. Therefore I think it most prudent
‘ to submit to the Decision of the Church.
‘ For I must own, that I have not Philo-
‘ sophy enough to hold an Argument with a
‘ Gentleman of your Learning. And as I
‘ have now removed all Doubts from my Mind,
‘ I am determin’d to have no more Dis-
‘ putes of any Kind, nor give any further
‘ Trouble ; but will continue a Member of
‘ that Church, let the Consequence be how it
‘ will. You seem to think, Sir, that some
‘ Motive of Interest prompted me to change,

vi P R E F A C E.

‘ but I can justify the contrary to God and the
 ‘ whole World. And I have great Reason to
 ‘ believe it will prove the Reverse. For I
 ‘ have not a Relation or Friend, but would
 ‘ persecute me to the utmost, were they to
 ‘ know it, which has been my only Reason
 ‘ for hitherto keeping it secret. And as you,
 ‘ Sir, were kind enough to promise me, when
 ‘ I first call’d upon you, not to divulge it, I
 ‘ must still entreat the same Favour, for the
 ‘ above Reasons; and I shall always look upon
 ‘ it as a particular Piece of Friendship, and
 ‘ will be ready, on every Occasion, to acknow-
 ‘ ledge my Gratitude for all Favours. I am,
 ‘ Sir,

‘ With the greatest Esteem,

Friday, 28 Oct.

‘ Your obliged and most

‘ Obedient Servant.’

*Immediately upon the Receipt of this extraor-
 dinary Declaration of his pre-determin’d Apost-
 tasy, I return’d him an Answer, which may
 give the Reader a more full and clear State of
 the Case between us, and whereof the following is
 a true Copy, viz.*

‘ S I R!

All-Saints Day, 1757.

‘ I Received yours, of last Friday’s Date,
 ‘ with Astonishment, after so many re-
 ‘ peated Professions of your sincere Attachment
 ‘ to the Truth only!

‘ You

P R E F A C E. vii

‘ You may remember, your first coming to
 ‘ my *Chapel* was your own voluntary Act ; and
 ‘ the last Time I saw you there was at the
 ‘ *Altar*, which gave me reason to believe you
 ‘ were serious, and well knew what you were
 ‘ about.

‘ When you imparted to me the *Doubts*
 ‘ which had possess’d you, and the *Books* from
 ‘ whence they had their Rise, I pointed to se-
 ‘ veral *Fallacies*, by which the *Romish* Emissa-
 ‘ ries are apt to seduce the Unwary. And, in
 ‘ order to give you that *Satisfaction*, which
 ‘ you then seem’d anxiously to desire, I gave
 ‘ you in Writing *five plain Propositions*, which
 ‘ I recommended to your serious Consideration,
 ‘ and which, I am confident, are sufficient to
 ‘ keep any sensible and sincere Person (who had
 ‘ been well instructed in the true Principles of
 ‘ the Church of *England*) from any Danger of
 ‘ revolting to that of *Rome*. At the same Time,
 ‘ I made you a fair Offer, that, if any one
 ‘ would attempt the *Disproof* of those *previous*
 ‘ *Propositions*, in Writing, in such a Manner as
 ‘ becomes a *Christian*, a *Scholar*, and a *Gentle-*
 ‘ *man*, I would return him a proper *Reply* with
 ‘ all due Respect.

‘ After *two Months* Expectation, there was
 ‘ left for me a Paper, importing such an *Answer*;
 ‘ and I had good Reason to depend upon your
 ‘ waiting a competent Time for my *Reply*, as I
 ‘ had done for the *Answer*.

‘ In the mean Time, while I was preparing
 ‘ it, in full Assurance of clearing up every

viii P R E F A C E.

‘ *Doubt* that could remain in an honest Mind,
 ‘ (and that too, not a very difficult Task,
 ‘ from any Thing alledged in the pretended
 ‘ Answer) I may well think you very hasty, in
 ‘ the Declaration you now make, of *your having*
 ‘ *remov’d all Doubts from your Mind, and being*
 ‘ DETERMIN’D TO HAVE NO MORE DIS-
 ‘ PUTES OF ANY KIND!

‘ You say, You *believe the Roman Catholic*
 ‘ *to be the ancient and true Church of Christ;*
 ‘ *and are fully convinced, that they teach nothing*
 ‘ *repugnant to the Word of God.* Now, this is
 ‘ the very Point in Question; of which you
 ‘ have yet seen but one Side, and therefore you
 ‘ can’t truly affirm, that your present *Belief* is
 ‘ well grounded *after the most serious Considera-*
 ‘ *tion.* But

‘ You say, You *have examin’d every Article*
 ‘ *of their Faith, with the greatest Strictness, and*
 ‘ *find every one of their Proofs in your own Bible.*
 ‘ But, is not this *one of the very Things,* against
 ‘ which your new Guides make so loud a Cla-
 ‘ mour, the *depending upon your own PRIVATE*
 ‘ *JUDGMENT in Articles of Faith?* No! you’ll
 ‘ say, ’tis rather a Point of *Prudence,* and a
 ‘ *Submission to the Decision of the Church!* But
 ‘ this, I must tell you, is a dangerous Mistake,
 ‘ and so you would have found it, if you had
 ‘ not been, too rashly, *hurried out of your own*
 ‘ *Depth.* For, the *Decision of the Church* (I
 ‘ mean, the CATHOLIC Church of Christ, pro-
 ‘ perly so call’d) is expressly contrary to that of
 ‘ modern Rome, in all the Points in Controversy
 ‘ with

P R E F A C E. ix

‘ with the Church of *England*; as I am able,
 ‘ and ready, to prove, to the Conviction of all,
 ‘ whose Eyes are not blinded with *Prejudices*
 ‘ against the Truth.

‘ However, since you seem to be so *infallibly*
 ‘ sure of the Truth of your present Persuasion,
 ‘ as to declare that you *shall no longer doubt of*
 ‘ *this or t’other Article of Faith, because you*
 ‘ *can’t comprehend it*, and for this extraordinary
 ‘ Reason, because *you are afraid it would in*
 ‘ *Time make you* DISBELIEVE THE WHOLE,
 ‘ (as if the *Christian Faith* were so infallibly as-
 ‘ certain’d in the present Articles of the modern
 ‘ Church of *Rome*, that you must necessarily
 ‘ believe them ALL, or NOTHING) I can’t pass
 ‘ this, without a serious Expostulation, upon
 ‘ some few, of the many Points in Controversy.

‘ Let me therefore ask you, *in the Name of*
 ‘ *God*, and as you must ANSWER IT AT THE
 ‘ LAST DAY; Can you so firmly *believe*, as to
 ‘ admit of *no longer Doubt*, that, in the Sacra-
 ‘ ment of the Eucharist, there is *truly, really,*
 ‘ *and* SUBSTANTIALLY contained WHOLE
 ‘ CHRIST, God-Man, Body and Blood, Bones,
 ‘ Nerves, Soul and Divinity, under the Species
 ‘ or APPEARANCE (only) of Bread and Wine?
 ‘ That the SAME BODY, which was born of the
 ‘ Virgin, and is now in Heaven, is in the Sa-
 ‘ crament? That, upon Consecration, there is
 ‘ a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread
 ‘ into the Substance of Christ’s Body; and of the
 ‘ whole Substance of the Wine into the Substance
 ‘ of Christ’s Blood? And that the Things seen
 ‘ and

P R E F A C E.

‘ *and tasted are the Accidents only of Bread and Wine; the Savour, Colour and Quantity of Bread and Wine, without any of their Substance; but, under those Accidents, there is ONLY the Body and Blood of Christ?*

‘ Can you believe, and no longer doubt, that this holy Sacrament is duly administer’d to the People, *only in one Kind*, when they are denied the Cup; NOTWITHSTANDING (’tis confess’d, that) *Christ* himself instituted the same to be received IN BOTH KINDS?

‘ Can you believe, and no longer doubt, that Divine Worship is due, or can be paid, without Danger of Idolatry, to the Consecrated Host, if the INTENTION of the Consecrator is *absolutely necessary* to the Being of a Sacrament? And yet, (though I suppose your Confessor will tell you the contrary) all these Things (and many more, as novel and unprimitive) you must believe! or else you can’t be, and *continue a Member of* (what you call) *the Roman-Catholic Church*. For, that Church has expressly injoin’d these, and other new Articles of Faith, (never held, or thought of, in the primitive Ages) under no less a Sanction, than the dreadful Pains of DAMNATION!

‘ Consider well therefore, (I beseech you) how rash and hazardous a Resolution that is, where you declare yourself so peremptorily *determin’d to continue a Member of that Church*, LET THE CONSEQUENCE BE HOW IT WILL! The Question is of the last Importance. No less than *eternal* Happiness or Misery depends
‘ upon

‘ upon it, as the *Consequence* of its Determina-
 ‘ tion: And, so long as you persist in your
 ‘ now-declar’d Resolution, *to have no more Dis-*
 ‘ *putes of any Kind*, you wilfully shut your
 ‘ Eyes against the Means of Conviction, and
 ‘ *consequently* render your own Salvation (at
 ‘ best but) doubtful!

‘ As to any *Motive of Interest*, that might
 ‘ be suppos’d to *prompt you to change*, I am no
 ‘ Way concern’d to meddle with it. The
 ‘ *Change* itself is the Thing, against which it
 ‘ behoves me to enter my Protest; and, as you
 ‘ were pleas’d to apply to me, as a *Casuis*t, in
 ‘ this Case of *Conscience*, (which is of the high-
 ‘ est Importance to the *Spiritual Interest* of us
 ‘ both to all Eternity, whatever we may think
 ‘ of other *Temporal Motives*) I can’t be silent,
 ‘ without violating my own Conscience, and
 ‘ the solemn Promise and Vow made, before
 ‘ God and his Church, *to be ready, with all*
 ‘ *faithful Diligence, to banish and drive away*
 ‘ *all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to*
 ‘ *God’s Word; and to use both public and private*
 ‘ *Monitions and Exhortations, as Need shall re-*
 ‘ *quire, and Occasion shall be given.*

‘ In a conscientious Regard of this Duty, it
 ‘ was, that, when you first open’d your Case
 ‘ to me, professing much Sorrow and Com-
 ‘ punction, for having unwarily gone a great
 ‘ Length in Compliance, without Consultation,
 ‘ my Compassion for your melancholy Case in-
 ‘ duced me readily to do my faithful Endeavour,
 ‘ to restore to you the Peace of Mind and Con-
 ‘ science,

' science, by shewing you how *erroneous* those
 ' *Doctrines* were, by which you had been art-
 ' fully drawn aside: And, at the same Time,
 ' out of personal Friendship, I was the more
 ' easily prevail'd with to *promise* you, *not to*
 ' *divulge* the Slip you had already made; hoping
 ' still, from my favourable Opinion of your
 ' good Sense and unprejudiced Judgment, that
 ' you would soon be set right again, by sound
 ' Arguments, founded upon unquestionable Au-
 ' thority.

' But now, to my great Surprise, I find how
 ' much I was mistaken. You had launch'd
 ' into the Deep, before you call'd for my Hand
 ' to help you; and when it was ready, you
 ' trusted to a new and strange Pilot to conduct
 ' you to an unknown Coast! In plain Terms,
 ' you seem to have call'd upon me, as it were
 ' only, *en passant*, in your Way to *Rome*; as if
 ' you would have it insinuated, that I had en-
 ' courag'd, rather than dissuaded you from pro-
 ' ceeding thither!

' Can you therefore, with any Reason, ex-
 ' pect or desire, that I shall think myself
 ' under any Obligation to keep a *Secret*, which
 ' will give the open Enemies of our Church
 ' Occasion for a public Triumph, as if they had
 ' Store and Strength of infallible Arguments to
 ' draw the Flock out of our Fold, and we had
 ' nothing to offer to keep them safe and steady
 ' within it? No! Sir, as the Case stands,
 ' you have driven me to the Necessity of appeal-
 ' ing to the World; if not for your Conviction,

' at

P R E F A C E. xiii

‘ at least to prevent other well-meaning People
 ‘ from being unwarily seduced, as you have been.

‘ You know, how long a Time your new
 ‘ Casuist and Confessor took, to consider my
 ‘ few short and plain *Propositions*: And, surely,
 ‘ you might, and ought to have allow’d me, at
 ‘ least, half as much; for my promis’d *Reply* to
 ‘ his pretended *Answer*, which he had spun
 ‘ out to more than six Times the Length of
 ‘ mine. Instead of which, you declare yourself
 ‘ convinced before-hand, and peremptorily *de-*
 ‘ *termin’d to have no more Disputes!*

‘ But, however implicitly you may pin your
 ‘ *Faith*, and venture your *Soul*, upon the Cre-
 ‘ dit of such specious Arguments as have been,
 ‘ over and over, clearly demonstrated to be
 ‘ weak, fallacious, impertinent, and inconclu-
 ‘ sive, I shall now leave the World to judge,
 ‘ (by what I had only prepar’d for your own
 ‘ particular Use) whether all the Collections
 ‘ your Confessor has made Shew of, from *Script-*
 ‘ *ture*, *Fathers*, and *Councils*, do not come far
 ‘ short of proving the Points for which he has
 ‘ produced them; and whether all my *Proposi-*
 ‘ *tions* do not stand firm and unshaken, not-
 ‘ withstanding all his Attempts and Artifices to
 ‘ undermine and overthrow them. For,

‘ The *Scripture* Texts which he has alledg’d,
 ‘ are fallaciously wrested to a Sense, not only
 ‘ contrary to the genuine Interpretation and
 ‘ Judgment of the primitive Church, but even
 ‘ to the whole Tenor and Analogy of the *Script-*
 ‘ *ture* itself! The *Councils* he refers to, are no-
 ‘ toriously

xiv P R E F A C E.

‘ toriously misreported ; and *Canons* confidently
‘ quoted, which never were made ! And the
‘ ancient *Fathers* conjur’d up, from corrupt
‘ Editions, to give Evidence of what is utterly
‘ inconsistent and irreconcilable with their own
‘ authentic Doctrines, Principles, and uniform
‘ Practice ! No Wonder then, if those who
‘ dare thus attempt to suborn *Fathers* and *Coun-*
‘ *cils*, and even the most *sacred Oracles*, to
‘ contradict themselves, in favour of a preca-
‘ rious *Hypothesis*, shall, with like Modesty and
‘ Conscience, falsify the *Histories*, or Records
‘ of the Church of *England*, to procure a Ver-
‘ dict in the unrighteous Case, which they so
‘ zealously prosecute against her.

‘ After all, though I dare not presume to
‘ judge of others, and especially of those who
‘ were bred up in the Errors of Popery, and
‘ continue, in Simplicity of Heart, without be-
‘ ing conscious of the dangerous Errors they
‘ had imbib’d from their Infancy ; (for, to *such*
‘ I was always inclin’d to extend great Hope and
‘ Charity :) Yet, I must tell *You*, very plainly,
‘ there is so little room for *either*, when a Man,
‘ who has been educated, and well instruct-
‘ ed in the sound Principles of the *Orthodox*
‘ Church of *England*, will revolt from her, and
‘ run, with his Eyes open, into the *Roman*
‘ Gulph, that, for my Part, I see no Reason to
‘ doubt, that the Salvation of *such* a one must
‘ be desperate, without extraordinary Repentance.

‘ This (I hope) may suffice at present :
‘ Which comes from the warm, and undisguis’d,
‘ Heart

P R E F A C E. vii

Heart of One, who, in all the Terms of
Christian Friendship, and true Catholic Cha-
rity, shall ever remain

‘ Your faithful Servant.’

By all this, the candid Reader will easily perceive, that I was now under a Necessity, either to suffer him, who had thus abruptly taken Leave of me, to march off, with his Leaders, in a vain shew of Triumph, without any further Notice; or else to lay before the World the Remarks I had prepar'd for his own more particular Use, upon the Paper, which plainly appears to have been concerted, as a plausible Excuse for a design'd Revolt: For, the Person principally concern'd having broke off all further Correspondence with me, and his Prompter keeping himself out of Sight, I had no Alternative left, but to produce it upon the public Stage.

Here then you have it at once, printed at large, from the original Manuscript, (as it came to my Hand;) and that with such a Punctilio of Exactness, that I would not pretend to correct (and therefore have not varied from it, even so much as in) the Orthography, or Spelling; but have left the many Mistakes therein to the Reader's Judgment, whether to be imputed to the Ignorance of an illiterate Amanuensis, or to the Inadvertency of its Author himself, whose affected Superiority in Learning is display'd throughout the whole Performance!

This,

xvi P R E F A C E.

This, however, I should not have taken Notice of, had it been to go no farther than to the private Hand, for which my Reply was at first intended. Yet now, since 'tis destin'd to the public View, I have not spar'd myself the Pains to enlarge the same, in divers Particulars, which otherwise had been pass'd over, as unnecessary, or impertinent to the main Question; but, for the Reader's Ease, and to prevent any Cavilling about the Connection of distant Passages, have also revised the several Arguments, as they lay in order before me, and subjoin'd my own Remarks upon the same, Paragraph by Paragraph.

Some, perhaps, may blame me, for spending my Time upon a Paper, which (they may think) did not deserve it. But, they may be assur'd, that it was not for want of other Imployment: And this must be allow'd, from every Day's Experience, that the most trifling Shews of Argument frequently serve, among those who are given to Change, to seduce them into various By-ways and Methods of Apostasy.

However, I doubt not but all true Christians will be ready to join with our Church, in those Suffrages of her incomparable Litany, That it may please God to strengthen such as do stand; to raise up them that fall; and to bring into the Way of Truth all such as have erred and are deceived!

Some plain Propositions recommended to the serious Consideration of all those who may be under any Temptation to forsake the Church of England, and revolt to that of Rome.

I. **T**HAT St. *Peter* himself (whose Successors the Popes pretend to be) was not a Whit superior to the rest of the Apostles.

II. That no such Supremacy, as is now asserted in the Popes, or Bishops of *Rome*, over all the Christian Church, was acknowledged, or pretended to, in several Ages after the Propagation of Christianity.

III. That the Means by which they first gained any Acknowledgment of such an Universal Supremacy were neither lawful nor warrantable, but, from Time to Time, controverted and opposed, as Usurpations.

IV. That in this Island (particularly) neither the Papal Supremacy, nor the other Doctrines of modern Popery, (by which it is distinguished from the true Church of *England*) ever had any uncontroverted Establishment or Authority.

V. That the Errors or Heresies of the several Sects, commonly comprehended under the general Denomination of *Protestants*, cannot so fairly be charged upon the true Church of *England*, as upon that of *Rome*, from whence they sprang.

It will not be necessary to enter into the more particular Points in Controversy, 'till these few Propositions be previously adjusted. But if any one shall think fit to attempt the Disproof of these, by writing, in such a Manner as becomes the Character of a Christian, a Scholar, and a Gentleman, he shall have a proper Reply, with all due Respect, from

30 July, 1757. A Priest of the Church of *England*.



*A Paper, pretended to be An ANSWER
to the foregoing Propositions.*

S R,

HAVING impartially consider'd your five propositions I am surpris'd that a gentleman of your qualification, should Advance such *fallacious stuff*, as will appear by the following answer
and first

That St. Peter was not superior to the Rest of the Apostles, which is your first proposition I answer, by distinguishing it thus, that they were equal in their calling to the apostleship I grant, in their power of *Government and Jurisdiction* I deny, and so doth the Scriptures, fathers, and Councils, as shall be evident to every impartial Reader — by the following.

and first from Scripture, St. Mat. 16th — 18th — where the allwise being changes Si-
meon's

meon's name to Peter, and as it was for some allwise end, and no other allwise end can be ascribed, then his being superior in Government, and Jurisdiction. therefore he was supream head of the Church, and of Consequence superior to the rest of the Apostles. and this is confirmd in John 21. where our bleesed Saviour gave St. Peter full Commiſſion, without the least exception, to feed both Lambs and Sheep, which of consequence implies the whole Church. add also that Christ pray'd for Peter, that his faith should not fail, and that when he was Converted, he should Confirm his Breethren. Lu. 22. 31. again: St. Mat. calls him the first, the Names of the 12 (faith) he, are these, the first Simeon who is called Peter: Cha. 10. ver. 2.

from whence I draw the following Conclutions. If Christ changed Simeons Name to Peter, it was for some wise End, and if no other wise can be ascribed then his supremacy of Government, and Jurisdiction, then he was supream head of the church.

But Christ did Change Simeon's name to Peter, and it was for some wise end. And no other wise End can be ascribed then his supremacy in Government and Jurisdiction.

therefore he was supream head of the church. the Major cannot be denyed without blasphemy, and the Minor is no less evident, except you can ascribe some other allwise End, then what is contain'd in either Major or Minor.

again

if Christ gave Peter power to feed both Lambs and Sheep, which of Necessity emplys the whole flock, then was Peter supream head of the Church.

But Christ gave Peter power to feed both Lambs, and Sheep which of necessity emplys the whole flock — therefore Peter was supream head of the Church.

the probation of the major and minor is evident, because twice Lambs and once Sheep, as they are comparative terms, must of necessity employ the whole flock, and of consequence the Rest of the Apostles, who were a part of the whole —

again

if Christ pray'd for Peter only, that his faith should not fail, and that he only, when he was converted, was to confirm his bretheren, (which were the apostles) then he was supream head of the Church.

But Christ pray'd for Peter only, that his faith should not fail, and that he only, when he was converted, was to confirm his brethren, (which were the apostles) Lu. 22.

therefore Peter was supream head of the Church.

the Major which only need be proved, is evident, because the weaker is confirm'd by the stronger.

and Lastly

if St. Peter was not the first in the apostleship, nor the Eldest in years, and St. Matt. doth call him

him the first, he must be supream head of the Church.

But St. Peter was not first in the Apostleship, nor the Eldest in years, and yet St. Mat. 10. 2. doth call him the first. therefore he was supream head of the Church.

The probation of the Major, is plain, for no other Reason can be given for his being call'd the first but his supremacy.

so far from scripture which has without any quibbling, sufficiently proved St. Peter's supremacy, and of consequence that of his successors.

Now I shall proceed to General Councils. the first Niceen Council (fathers 328) approv'd by pope Sylvester, An: Dom 325, Decreed that he who holds the see of Rome, is the head and Chiefe of all the patriarchs, seeing he the first to whom all power Ecclesiastical is given over all Christian princes, and all their people, and whoever shall Contradict this is Excommunicated by the Synod, Can. 39 Arob.

the first Constantinopolitan Council (fathers 150) An. Dom 381 Defined, that St. Peter was head and prince of the Apostles, and the power of Loosing and binding sins, was given to St. Peter by our Lord, who in his successors Liv's and exercises Judgment, to this very time, and allways Act. 3.

the Calcedon Council (fathers 600) pope Leo presiding An: Dom. 451: in the 3d Action pope Leo is call'd universal archbishop of old Rome, and sentence is pronounced against Dioscorus, in the Name of Leo and St. Peter,

to acknowledge Leo be be St. Peter's Successor.

thus much from the first three general Councils and now lett us hear what the fathers say.

in the first age, St. Dennis the Arcopagite affirms, that he and Timothy were both present at the bleesed virgin Mary's Death, and there was also present both James the Brother of our Lord, and Peter supream and antient top of Devnes he is cited by St. John Damascen. orat. 2.

in the second age, St. Irenaeus, all Churches round about, ought to resort to the Romane Church, by Reason of her Most powerfull principallity. l. 3 c 3 and again the Romane Church is the greatest and most antient founded at Rome, by St. Peter and St. Paul, l 3. valent c 3. in the third age Origen

when the Chiefe Charge of feeding Christs sheep was given to St. Peter and the Church founded upon him c. 6 Epist. ad Roman in the same age St. Cypian. we hold Peter the head of the Church, Epist ad Julian and in another place he calls the Church of Rome St. Peter's Chair Epist 55

in the fourth age St. Basil calls St. Peter that blessed one, who was prefer'd before the Rest of the apostles. Sermon de Judecio Dei.

in the same age St. Athanasius — thou art Peter upon thy foundation, pillars of the church that is the Bishops are fortified — in Epist ad felicem

in the same age St. Epiphanius — he chose Peter Captin of his disciples — Heares 51

in the same age St. Cyril of Jerusalem — Peter the prince (saith he) and most Excellent of all the Apostles — Cateches 2

in the same age St. Chrysostome — the paster and head of the Church was once a poor fisher man Homil. 55. in mathacum

in the same age Ecumenius — not James but Peter riseth, as being both more fervent and also the president of the Disciples — in c. 1. Actorum.

in the same age Optatus Milevitanus — in this Chair fate Peter the head of the Apostles — 1. 2. Cont. parmen.

in the same age Eusebius Emiffenus — he first committed his Lambs afterwards his Sheep, to Peter because he made not pastor but pastor of pastors Sermon de nativ S. Jo.

in the same age St. Ambrose — Adrew first followed our Saviour yet Andrew recived not the premacy but Peter. — in 2 Cor. 12.

in the fifth age St. Augustin speaking of Peter's penance sayes, he cures the whole bodies disease in the very head of the Church — Serm 12 de 4 temporibus. and again Peter the head of the Apostles the Gate keeper of heaven, and the foundation of the Church : Epist. 86. and in another place — of whom Peter the Apostle by reason of the premacy of Apostleship. — tract ultimo Joannem —

thus farr from Councils and fathers
from whence I draw this Conclution

if three Genaral Councils and the fathers of the first five Centuries did define, teach, and believe, that St. Peter and his Successors were supream head of the Church, then it was universally acknowledg'd in this Nation, and all others, and was not userp'd —

But the three Genaral Councils and the fathers of the first five Centuries did define teach and believe that St. Peter and his Successors were Supream head of the Church.

therefore it was acknowledg'd in this nation and all others and not userp'd.

the major is proved from the Consent of our adversaries, who grant, that for the first five Centuries the Church had not err'd, and the Minor is prov'd, from the above Citations of Councils and fathers.

But the Gentleman will Reply that this nation in particular did not acknowledge the popes Supremacy to which I answer —

if this nation did not acknowledge the popes supremacy, then she was not in Communion with the Church in the first five Centuries.

But she was in Communion with the Church in the first five Centuries as appears by her Representatives, being universally received, at the Councils of Arls, Sardica, and Armenium.

therefore she did acknowledge the popes supremacy

Sr

thus having fairly answered, without any quibbling, four of your propositions, I shall now

now begin with your fifth, also with some small remarks on your priesthood.

the sum of your 5th proposition is that the errors, and heresies, that have sprung up within these two hundred years, came from the Church of Rome, and not from the Church of England, which you ought to have proved Either from some Doctrine in general, or particular, that the Church of Rome believeth, or teacheth, which you can never do — But wee can prove a Doctrine, Believed, and taught, by the Church of England that has open'd a wide gapp for all heresy, nay and infidelity, for what else can be Expected when your 11th article unto which you all swear and subscribe in your pretended ordination, say's that not by Works but by faith (only) a man is Justified — if so, then there's no necessity for feeding the hungry, cloathing the naked, or visiting the sick, and those that are in prison, altho' our bleesed Saviour has pronounced damnation on the contrary — St. Paul adds if a man has all faith even to remove mountains and has not Charity, it availeth nothing, (then faith only will not suffice) I would add St. James (but him you give the lie) who says, that not by faith only, but by works a man is Justified — your hear St. James says that not by faith only but by works a man is Justified, whereas you say by faith only — therefore att the Least your Doctrine tends to infidelity.

as for your 20th and 21st articles they teach your Church in controversies of faith, has an
authority

authority but its a fallible one, if so then evry man is a Judge for him self, from whence it is that all these sectaries spung, for evry mans private Judgment is fallible. and of Consequence no infallible Certainty what to believe

Now Sr

I humbly presume I have sufficiently answered your five propositions and according to my promise make some remarks on your priesthood

My observations thus

that these words priest, Alter, and Sacrifice, are Corrolatives for the word priest, absolutely presupposeth Alter, and Sacrifice, as the word father presupposeth a childe, or children, for the one is absolutely necessary to constitute the other — this being premised.

I ask this question, were is your Alter and Sacrefice, Some times indeed, you call your Communion table Alter, But then, were is your Sacrifice, when you acknowledge no other then that which was once offer'd on the Cross upon mount Calvary, if so, I would advise you not to assume that sacred Charecter to which you can claim no right, for want of ordination, Alter and Sacrefice.

as for your ordination, your own historys prove, your Church never had any, one instance, shall suffice, instead of many, that might be cited.

When Bonner Bishop of London was prisoner in the Clink, Horn's Chancellor tendered the oath of supremacy, on the refusal he was indicted at the king's Bench, Bishop Bonner pleaded

pleaded that Horn was no Bishop, the cause came before the Judges, and the Judges gave it in favour of Bonner. Dr. Heylin on the 8th of Eliz 1565—1566—from whence its plain that Horn had no Legal ordination, for if had he would have brought the certificate and not Left it to 12 Judges.



REMARKS *upon a written* PAPER,
pretended to be an ANSWER *to* FIVE
PROPOSITIONS *concerning the* POPISH
CONTROVERSY. *By the Author of*
the said PROPOSITIONS.

I HAVE seen a Paper, purporting an *Answer* to Five plain *Propositions* recommended to the serious Consideration of all those who may be under any Temptation to forsake the Church of *England*, and revolt to that of *Rome*: And now, according to my Promise, I shall give a *proper Reply*, by way of *Remarks* upon that *Answer*, with all *due Respect* to its Author, and the Importance of the Subject.

How well he has acquitted himself in this Performance, as a *Christian*, a *Scholar*, and a *Gentleman*, the Reader is now to judge; as well as of the *Impartiality*, and *fair Dealing*, of which he makes profession.

As a Specimen of one of these amiable Characters, he begins with expressing his *Surprise*,
that

that a Gentleman of my *Qualifications* should advance (what he is pleas'd to call) *such fallacious Stuff!* However, waving all formal Compliments, I doubt not but to make it plain, in the Sequel, that the FALLACY is not on our Side of this Controversy; and that those *Propositions* still require a more serious Consideration, and a more solid Answer, than he has yet offer'd to give to any of them. For,

The first *Proposition* is, ' That St. Peter himself (whose Successors the Popes pretend to be) was not a Whit superior to the rest of the Apostles.' In Answer to which, tho' he makes a great Shew of proving that St. Peter was *superior to the rest of the Apostles*, yet he has taken so little Notice of what is inclos'd in the *Parentthesis*, (concerning those who only PRETEND to be his Successors) that he has left the main Point in Question still in Debate, and the Popes in Need of another Advocate. For, should we grant (but for Argument-sake only) that St. Peter himself had been *superior to the rest of the Apostles*, yet it would not follow, that the Popes are now entitl'd to the same Supremacy over the whole Church, under the Pretence of their being his Successors in the See of Rome.

But, reserving this, to be further discuss'd hereafter, as Occasion offers, let us see how St. Peter's own Supremacy is here attempted to be prov'd.

This Gentleman grants, by distinguishing, that the Apostles were equal in their Calling to
the

the Apostleship; but denies that they were so in their Power of Government and Jurisdiction: In support of which he appeals to the Evidence of the Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, for the Satisfaction of every impartial Reader.

And first, from SCRIPTURE, he cites St. Matth. xvi. 18. where (he says) the All-wise Being changes Simeon's NAME to Peter: And as it was for some all-wise End, and no other all-wise End can be ascribed, than his being superior in Government and Jurisdiction; therefore he was Supream Head of the Church; and of Consequence, Superior to the rest of the Apostles.

Here I must previously observe, how this Gentleman does not only mistake the Text, where the Name was so chang'd, but manifestly wrests it also to serve a Turn. It was at Peter's first Introduction to Christ, that his Name was chang'd, or (more properly) an Addition made to it of Cephias, which, in the then vulgar Syriac Language, signifies a Rock, or Stone; (St. John i. 42.) and here 'tis only repeated by that of Peter, which, in the Greek, has but the same Signification. Why then is so great a Stress laid upon the latter, more than on the former? For if the Change (or Addition) of the Name must necessarily prove, or imply, a Supremacy, it might be as rational to infer a Supremacy in James and John, from our Lord's giving them the Surname of Boanerges, (St. Mark iii. 17.) thereby signifying the great Efficacy of their Endeavours in their Master's Service; especially considering the many Marks
of

of special Favour which our Lord had shew'd to them, no less than to *Peter* : And, as to him, the other Name of *Cephas* might, surely, prove it, as well as that of *Peter* ; which yet is not here pretended to. Or, if our Lord's calling him *Peter*, must here necessarily infer a Commission to constitute him *Supream Head of the Church*, the popish Advocates ought well to consider, what may be, as rationally, concluded, from that other Text, where the same Lord, soon after this, in as express Terms, calls him SATAN ! (St. *Matth.* xvi. 23, and St. *Mark* viii. 33.)

But, because I have a Master in *Logic* here to deal with, I must not omit to pay my due Respects to his Arguments, as he has form'd them, in Mood and Figure, thus :

‘ If *Christ* changed *Simeon*'s Name to *Peter*,
 ‘ it was for some wise End ; and if no other
 ‘ wise End can be ascribed, than his Supremacy
 ‘ of Government and Jurisdiction, then he was
 ‘ Supream Head of the Church :

‘ But, *Christ* did change *Simeon*'s Name to
 ‘ *Peter*, and it was for some wise End ; and
 ‘ no other wise End can be ascribed than his
 ‘ Supremacy in Government and Jurisdiction ;
 ‘ Therefore, he was Supream Head of the
 ‘ Church.’

The Major (he says) cannot be denied without Blasphemy : And the *Minor* is no less evident, unless I can ascribe some other all-wise End than what is contain'd in either *Major* or *Minor*.

But,

But, with his good Leave, the *Minor* is not so *evident* as he imagines. For, 'tis well known, that our Blessed Lord, in the declaring any Divine Truth, was wont to make use of some sensible Similitude, then near at Hand, the better to represent it to, and make the deeper Impression upon the Minds of his Hearers; as by the metaphorical Phrase of *Living Water*, to the Woman of *Samaria* at *Jacob's Well*, (St. *John* iv. 10.) and *Bread of Life*, to the hungry Multitude, (St. *John* vi. 35.) So, by way of Allusion to the additional Name of *Peter*, which he had before given to this Disciple, he now took occasion to represent the Firmness and Solidity of that Foundation on which his Church should be built, saying, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*. But, though I dare not be so bold, as this Gentleman is, precisely to define the particular *wise Ends* of our Saviour's Actions; this, however, I will presume to say, that the giving to *Simon* (or *Simeon*, as he calls him) the Surname of *Peter* was neither intended, nor understood, to be, for the conferring on him the *Supremacy in Government and Jurisdiction*; as I shall demonstrate by and by.

In the mean Time, this Gentleman proceeds to urge his former Argument, by alledging, that *this is confirm'd in John xxi. where our Blessed Saviour gave St. Peter full Commission, without the least Exception, to feed both Lambs and Sheep, which of consequence implies the whole Church*. Upon which he argues thus :

‘ If

‘ If *Christ* gave *Peter* Power to feed both
 ‘ Lambs and Sheep, which of necessity im-
 ‘ plies the whole Flock, then was *Peter* Su-
 ‘ pream Head of the Church :

‘ But, *Christ* gave *Peter* Power to feed both
 ‘ Lambs and Sheep, which of necessity im-
 ‘ plies the whole Flock ;

‘ Therefore, *Peter* was Supream Head of
 ‘ the Church.’

Of which also, he says, *the Probation of the Major and Minor is evident : Because twice Lambs, and once Sheep, as they are comparative Terms, must of necessity imply the whole Flock ; and of consequence, the rest of the Apostles, who were a Part of the Whole.*

But the Fallacy of this Argument may sufficiently be expos’d, by observing, 1. That this Text was not intended to give *Peter* any new Office or Authority, but only to restore him to his former Degree, of which he had render’d himself unworthy. For, as he had before betray’d a great Defect of *Love* for his Master, by a threefold Denial and an Abjuration of him ; so now, *Christ* was pleas’d to give him Occasion for a threefold Profession and Protestation of his *Love*, that the Degrees of his Recovery might be proportionable to those of his Fall. 2. That as the Charge to *feed the Lambs*, imported an extraordinary Admonition to exert his utmost Diligence in his Office and Duty, to instruct, exhort, and comfort the *young and tender* Part of the Flock, those late Converts, who were now to be left like *Lambs* in the Midst of
 Wolves ;

Wolves; so, that repeated Charge to *feed the Sheep* (for, by the by, it is not, as this Gentleman states it, *twice Lambs and once Sheep*, but once *Lambs*, and twice *Sheep*) imported the like Care of the *elder Christians* also, whom he would intrust to him and his Collegues, and for whom he and they were all equally to be accountable to him at the last Day. But, that *the rest of the Apostles were a Part of the Flock*, which *Peter* was to *feed*, instruct, and govern, is a Doctrine neither consistent with Scripture, Antiquity, nor right Reason: For, 3. He who said to *Peter* here, *Feed my Lambs*, and *Feed my Sheep*, said as expressly to ALL the Apostles, *Go ye into all the World*; (St. Mark xvi. 15.) — *Teach all Nations*; (St. Matth. xviii. 19.) — *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you*; (St. John xx. 21.) All which Scripture-Texts do, surely, comprehend as ample a Commission and Authority, as that here in question can do, and in much more express and significant Terms too. 4. That this is no new or unwarrantable Interpretation of this Text, is evident (among many others) from the Authority even of some of the Ancient Fathers, to whom this Gentleman himself has appeal'd as Witnesses on his Side of the Question. For, the Church of *Rome* itself, in a Synodical Epistle to the Church of *Carthage*, in the Time of St. *Cyprian*, says, *THE REST of the Disciples performed this Office of Feeding the Sheep, IN THE LIKE MANNER that Peter did it.* (Cypr. Ep. 3.) *Which Sheep, and which Flock*

C

(saith

(saith St. *Ambrose*) not only Blessed Peter did then undertake, but both he hath undertaken them with us, and ALL WE have undertaken them with him, (*Ambr. de dignit. Sacerd. C. 2.*) And so St. *Augustine* saith also, When it is said to Peter, it is said to ALL, Lovest thou me? Feed my Sheep. (*August. de Agone Christi, C. 30.*) To which I shall add only, 5. Another Argument, *ad Hominem*, to oblige this acute *Logician* in his own Way, thus:

Christ gave full Commission to all the Apostles (and consequently to St. *Andrew*, as one among the rest) to preach the Gospel to every Creature, (*St. Mark xvi. 15.*) without the least Exception:

But Peter was a Creature:

Therefore *Christ* gave full Commission to St. *Andrew* (as one among the rest of the Apostles) to preach the Gospel to St. Peter!

Here neither the *Major* nor *Minor* can be denied without Blasphemy. Therefore (according to this Gentleman's Manner of arguing) St. Peter himself was committed to the Care and Government of St. *Andrew*: And consequently St. *Andrew* was the Superior; and Head of the Church!

Another Argument here produced by this Gentleman, in Support of his Hypothesis, is, That *Christ* PRAYED for Peter, that his Faith should not fail; and that when he was converted, he should confirm his Brethren, *St. Luke xxii. 31.* Which he has reduced into Form, thus:

‘ If *Christ* prayed for *Peter*, only, that his
 ‘ Faith should not fail, and that he, only, when
 ‘ he was converted, was to confirm his Bre-
 ‘ thren, (which were the Apostles;) then he
 ‘ was Supreme Head of the Church;

‘ But, *Christ* prayed for *Peter*, only, that his
 ‘ Faith should not fail, and that he, only,
 ‘ when he was converted, was to confirm his
 ‘ Brethren, (which were the Apostles,)

‘ Therefore, *Peter* was Supreme Head of
 ‘ the Church, *Luke xxii.*’

And this, according to its Author, must be
 enforced, by his saying, *The Major, which
 only need be proved, is evident, because the
 Weaker is confirm’d by the Stronger.*

But, according to my small Skill in *Logic*,
 there seems to be a Fallacy in the whole Frame
 of it: For, 1. It does not appear, by the In-
 troduction, that these Words were spoken to
Peter himself ONLY, but to *all* the Apostles in
 the Person and Name of *one*, as we find the
 like in many other Places of Scripture. The
 Context shews, what *Strife* there had been
among them for Supremacy, and how sharply
 our Lord had rebuk’d them for that Affecta-
 tion: And, after he had assur’d them that, for
 the Humiliation and Sufferings, to which they
 were liable here, they should be amply re-
 warded with Exaltation and Glory hereafter,
 he turns to *Simon* (redoubling his proper Name,
Simon, Simon, without the Addition of *Peter*)
 declaring, how watchful *Satan* was, to shake
 them *all* from their Stedfastness in the Faith;

but withal comforting *him* (whose Weakness and unhappy Fall he then foresaw) with an Assurance, that he *had prayed for him*, in particular, that *his Faith* might *not fail him*, utterly, in the Day of Trial; and admonishing him, that when he should be *converted*, and recover'd from his Fall, by a sincere Repentance, he should redouble his Diligence, to *confirm*, or *strengthen*, *his Brethren*, lest they should also fall. 2. 'Tis not yet *evident*, but still *needs to be prov'd*, that the rest of *the Apostles* were the BRETHREN whom he was to *confirm* and *strengthen*. On the contrary, 'tis most consonant to the best Authority, to understand the *Brethren* here, to be meant of the *Lambs* and *Sheep*, (mention'd in the foregoing Argument) over whom THE REST of *the Apostles* were Shepherds and Overseers, as well as, and equally with, *Peter*; and who did accordingly exert themselves, in *confirming* and *strengthening* the *Brethren*, as we find, by their several Epistles, and other Labours. So that, 3. As our Lord's *praying* for *Peter* was only on account of his frequent boasting of his own Resolution and Self-sufficiency, though *Christ* well knew how apt his *Faith* would be to *fail*, without the Support of Divine Grace, no sound Reason can be given, to conclude from the Admonition there next following, that *Peter* was thereby intended to be made *Supream Head of the Church*: For, though it is true *the weaker is confirm'd* (or *strengthen'd*) *by the stronger*; yet that is to be understood with respect only to
that

that particular Act, but cannot, in common Sense, imply an universal Supremacy and Jurisdiction over him.

Yet there is another *Medium* still to be consider'd, whereby this Gentleman endeavours to prove the same. He says, *St. Matthew calls him the FIRST. The Names of the Twelve Apostles* (saith he) *are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, (St. Matth. x. 2.)*

From whence he draws the following Conclusion:

' If *St. Peter* was not the *first* in the Apostleship, nor the eldest in Years, and *St. Matthew* doth call him *the first*, he must be Supream Head of the Church:

' But *St. Peter* was not the *first* in the Apostleship, nor the eldest in Years, and yet *St. Matthew* (x. 2.) doth call him *the first*;

' Therefore he was Supream Head of the Church.'

Of which (he boldly says) *The Probation of the Major is plain: For, no other Reason can be given for his being call'd the first, but his Supremacy.*

But here, how plain soever the Gentleman may think the *Probation* to be, 'tis much more plain, that it is only a Begging the Question. For, 1. That *St. Peter* was not the *first in the Apostleship*, is plainly contrary to *Scripture*: Where it appears, that, though he was not *the first* of the Disciples who came to *Christ*; yet, when they were afterwards called from their secular Employments, to be his constant Attendants,

dants, he stands *the first*, in the Order of Nomination, before his Brother *Andrew* and the Sons of *Zebedee*. (St. *Matth.* iv. 18. and St. *Mark* i. 16.) And, 2. That he was *the eldest in Years*, we have upon the express Authority of St. *Chrysostom*, (whom this Gentleman voucheth elsewhere as a Witness on his Side) as well as many other ancient Writers; whom Cardinal *Baronius* himself (*Ann.* 31, p 23.) confesseth to have look'd upon *Peter* as the *elder Brother*: And it was on this Account only, of his *Age* and *Gravity*, that St. *Jerome* (*Adv. Jovin.* l. 1.) concludes him to have had the Rank of Precedency before St. *John*, the beloved Disciple. But, 3. 'Tis evident, in fact, that no necessary Conclusion can be drawn in favour of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, from his being nam'd *the first* by St. *Matthew*: 'For, among the no less inspir'd Writers, there are several Passages wherein he is nam'd, with other Apostles, and yet not set *the first*; as particularly in St. *John* i. 44. 1 *Cor.* iii. 22. and ix. 5. and *Gal.* ii. 9.

Thus far have I attended the Gentleman thro' a Chain of Arguments (such as they are) *from Scripture*: Whereby he flatters himself that he has, without any Quibbling, sufficiently proved St. *Peter's* Supremacy; and of Consequence, that of his Successors. But he triumphs before the Victory: For, as to St. *Peter's* own Supremacy (and consequently that of his Successors) the whole Tenor of *Scripture*, in general, is clearly against him, as well as the particular Texts before

fore examin'd; so that my first Proposition is yet far from being disprov'd. For,

1. It is evident, even from the *Scripture* itself, That THE REST OF THE APOSTLES were so far from understanding any *Supremacy*, or other Privilege, granted by our Lord to St. *Peter*, exclusive of, or *superior* to, themselves, that we find them, even after the Promise of *the Keys*, frequently disputing, and *reasoning* among themselves, *which of them should be the GREATEST*; for which Affectation of *Supremacy* our Lord was pleas'd to rebuke them all, as a Thing which he did not authorize, or allow, in any one, more than another, of them, (St. *Matth.* xviii. 1. St. *Mark* ix. 34. and St. *Luke* ix. 46.) Had there indeed been any such Notion entertain'd among them, of a *Supremacy* already granted to St. *Peter*, how could the two Sons of *Zebedee* have presum'd to solicit (as we find they did) for the Preheminence above him? Or why should any of the other *Ten* (except St. *Peter* himself) be so *much displeased*, and *moved with Indignation against the two Brethren*, (as it is plain they all were) for affecting That, which every one of them thought himself equally entitled to? (St. *Matth.* xx. 20, &c. and St. *Mark* x. 35, &c.) But, we find, they all continued to be full of this unwarrantable Ambition, even after they had participated with our Lord himself at his last *Supper*! (St. *Luke* xxii. 24.) And that St. *Paul* (in his Time) though he had his Revelation immediately from Heaven, yet had no Notion of St. *Peter's* Su-

premacý, is evident, from what he himself avers, that he *withstood him to the Face*, and reprov'd him openly for his Prevarication, (*Gal. ii. 11, &c.*) which we may be sure, none of the inspir'd Apostles would have presum'd to do, if St. Peter had been either *Smpreme* or *Infallible*! On the contrary, St. Paul claim'd, at least, an Equality with him, where he affirm'd himself to be *in Nothing behind the very chiefest Apostles*, (*2 Cor. xi. 5, and xii. 11.*) which alone is a full Proof of my first Proposition. Nay, moreover,

2. 'Tis manifest, That St. PETER HIMSELF never had any Notion of such a *Supremacy* vested in him, as is now claim'd at *Rome*, by his pretended *Succeffors*. If he had, he surely would not have condescended to give an Account of his Conduct to those who *contended with him*, on a Supposition of his being guilty of an irregular and unwarrantable Proceeding: And, much less would he have thought it necessary (as he did *Acts xi.*) to plead in his Justification, an Authority superior to his own. But, to clear up this, 'tis more especially to be observ'd, That, in the great Council at *Jerusalem*, where *the Apostles and Elders came together*, to determine the Controversy about Circumcision, tho' St. Peter was there (not represented by Proxy or Legate, but) personally present, he was so far from exerting himself under any such pretended Character (as the modern Zealots for the Papal Supremacy presume to give him) of *the Visible Head of the Church, Universal Bishop, Prince*

Prince of the Apostles, and Christ's Vicar, &c. that he neither spake *the first*, as with Authority, to open the Council, nor *the last*, to pronounce the Decree: Neither did he speak *at all*, 'till *after there had been much disputing*; and that *but once*, as *Barnabas and Paul* also did, declaring severally, *what Miracles and Wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them*: But the final *Sentence* was authoritatively given by *St. James*, who, being the proper Bishop of the Place, was President of the Council held there; and accordingly, the whole Council assenting to the Judgment, so pronounced (not by *St. Peter*, but) by *St. James*, the decretal Epistles were drawn up, and sent abroad to the several Churches, in the Names, and by the JOINT Authority of them ALL. Neither was the Question determin'd in compliance with the Sentiment of *St. Peter*, (who pleaded for an Exemption of the converted *Gentiles* from the *Yoke and Burden* of the *Mosaic Law* in general) but according to the Judgment of *St. James*, who thought it fit to oblige them still to some few particular *necessary* Observances, which *St. Peter* had not so much as mention'd, (*Acts xv.*) which of itself, might be sufficient to obviate all Pretence of a Supremacy in any of his *Suc- cessors*, from other *General Councils*, since 'tis plain, he was not allow'd any himself, in this, which was a Pattern and Precedent to all the rest. To all which may be added, that tho' *St. Peter* wrote two Catholic Epistles, for *con- firming and strengthening the Brethren*, he gives
not

not the least Hint of any such singular *Supremacy*, as is here contended for, in either of them; but calls himself only a *Fellow-Elder* with the other *Elders* of the Church, and exhorts them also to FEED *the Flock of God*, (1 *Pet.* v. 1, 2.) which is the very same in Sense with the Charge which *Christ* had before given to *him*, in the before alledg'd Text, (St. *John* xxi. 15, 16, 17.) but does not import any Grant of *Supremacy*, to the one more than to the other. Neither, in that Gospel, which St. *Mark* is said to have written by his Direction, does he once mention the suppos'd Preheminence in the Promise of the *Keys*, but only the Confession of *Christ's* Divinity which was made by him, as the Speaker of the whole College of Apostles, (St. *Mark* viii. 29.) On the contrary, this very *Peter*, whom the Papists affect to call the *Rock of the Church*, and the FOUNDATION upon which *Christ* did build the same, expressly calls *Christ* himself the *Living Stone*, and the *Chief Corner-Stone*, foretold by the Prophet *Isaiab*, as the *Foundation*, upon which every one must build, who will come to be a Part, or Member, of the *Christian Church*, (*Acts* iv. 11. and 1 *Pet.* ii. 4, &c.) In short, if *Peter* had entertain'd any Notion, that He himself was a joint, or secondary, *Foundation* of this spiritual Building, (which 'tis plain he had not, or else) he would have directed his Flock to come to *him*, as that *Chief Corner-Stone*, which God of old had predicted

predicted he would lay in *Sion*, as the *Foundation* of his Church, together with *Christ*.

Here I might rest the Whole of our present Controversy, with respect to *Scripture* Authority: But, since there is one of the Texts refer'd to by this Gentleman, of which he has not made the common Use, I shall not think it improper to subjoin a short and true State of the Case, as being the most commonly insisted on by other Advocates on that Side of the Question.

The Text I mean is that in *St. Matth. xvi. 18, 19*, where our Saviour's Words are, *I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon THIS ROCK I will build my Church; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give unto thee the KEYS of the Kingdom of Heaven: And whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*

Here, we learn from the Context, 1. That our Lord, having ask'd *his Disciples*, what Opinion *the People* had entertain'd of him, and being told what they had severally heard, was pleas'd to put this Question to themselves, *But whom say YE that I am?* Which being demanded of them *all in general*, and consequently requiring but *one Answer*, in a Point wherein they were all agreed, *Simon Peter* (as it were the Foreman of a Jury, pronouncing the Verdict for himself and his Brethren) made Answer, at once for all, saying, *Thou art the Christ*

Christ of God, the Son of the Living God, (St. *Matth.* xvi. 13 — 16. St. *Mark* ix. 27 — 29. and St. *Luke* ix. 18 — 20.) And this was so far from being the particular Profession of St. *Peter* himself only, that it is no more than what he had before expressly declar'd to be the firm and common Creed of them *all*, (upon the Defection of the Multitude) when he said, *We believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the Living God*, (St. *John* vi. 69.) 2. What our Lord said in Reply to this Profession, though spoken in the *singular* Number, as if directed personally to *Peter* only, cannot reasonably be construed exclusively of the rest, any more than what he had said elsewhere (St. *Luke* v. 10:) can be understood to qualify *Peter* alone, exclusive of his Partners, to *catch Men*, that is, to draw or win them to him by preaching the Gospel. But as the Profession of their Belief in *Christ* was made by the Mouth of *one* of them (as is necessary in all orderly Societies, to avoid Confusion) so was *Christ's* Reply return'd to that *One*, who spake in the Name of all the rest, to denote the *Unity* which he would have in his Church. 3. Tho' the Expositors are not agreed, whether the *Rock* is here properly meant of *Peter* himself, or of the *Faith* which he had then profess'd, or rather of *Christ* himself; (for in favour of those two latter Opinions there are many eminent Interpreters, as well as of the former;) this, however, is undeniable, even upon the Authority of Holy *Scripture* itself, that

that our Lord doth not say, *Thou art Peter, and upon Thee I will build my Church*, but upon *this Rock*; plainly alluding to something else: And, according to the same Metaphor, ALL the Apostles are equally call'd *Foundations*, yea, said to be the *Twelve Foundations upon which the Walls of the new Jerusalem* (meaning the Evangelical Church) *is built*, (*Rev. xxi. 14.* and *Eph. ii. 20.*) and sometimes others of them, as well as *Peter*, are called *Pillars*, with relation to the Church already built, (*Gal. ii. 9.*)

4. What our Lord added here, by way of Anticipation only, saying to *Peter*, in the future Tense, I WILL GIVE unto THEE the *Keys*, &c. he immediately explain'd, by saying, *and whatsoever thou shalt bind*, &c. meaning the full Exercise of Ecclesiastical Government and Jurisdiction: Which he soon after promised to all the Apostles together, in the very same Words, only changing the Singular Number into the Plural, thus, *Whatsoever YE shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever YE shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*, (*St. Matth. xviii. 18.*) And accordingly, what he thus promised, he did perform to them in general, when, after his Resurrection, he spake to them in the present Tense, and gave them their full Commission, saying, *Whosoever Sins YE remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins YE retain, they are retained*, (*St. John xx. 23.*) In virtue of which extensive Commission, we find, *St. Paul* excommunicating the incestuous Corinthian,

Corinthian, not as by any Authority delegated from *St. Peter*, but absolutely by his own Apostolical Authority, derived immediately from *Christ* himself, (1 *Cor.* v. 3, 4, 5.) Neither had the *Apostles* themselves only, but the *Bishops* also, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, had their own respective Ecclesiastical Courts, for the Exercise of their Jurisdiction, to receive *Accusations*, (1 *Tim.* v. 19.) to give in Charge what *Doctrine* was to be taught, (— i. 3.) — and to stop the Mouths of the unruly Deceivers: (*Tit.* i. 10, 11.) All which Power of Jurisdiction those *Bishops* evidently received (as the Scriptures testify) from *St. Paul* himself, and not from *St. Peter*, as the now pretended Foundation of all Spiritual Jurisdiction. And, 5: There is not one of the *Apostles* that ever gave the least Hint of such a peculiar Prerogative of *St. Peter*; or of any Subjection due to *him*, on that Account, from all the Churches, and much less to his *Successors*: But their several Injunctions were only that they should obey those who had the Rule over them in the Lord, who watched for their Souls, and admonished them; that is, to their own proper Pastors and Governors, in their respective Places and Stations, (1 *Thes.* v. 12. and *Hebr.* xiii. 17.) and to build up themselves on their most holy Faith, (*St. Jude* 20.)

From these, and the other Texts of Scripture herein before discuss'd, as well as from several more (which need not here to be super-added) we may fairly conclude, as it necessarily

rily follows upon the Whole, that our Lord never gave to St. *Peter* any *personal* Prerogative of *Universal Supremacy* over the *Christian Church*; and much less to those who were to be *his Successors* in the See of *Rome*, as is here contended for. The most that can be fairly gather'd from the peculiar Circumstances of his Case, is, that he was made choice of to be the *first* to open the Gate, to let the *Gentiles* into the Church of *Christ*, by the Conversion of *Cornelius* and his Family, (to which he refers in what he said in the Council at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* xv. 7.) Yet, though he then laid the first Stone in the Foundation of Faith among them, that did not give him the Supremacy, even over *them*; for St. *Paul* had the Distinction of Honour to be the *Apostle of the Gentiles*, (*Rom.* xi. 13.) and, as such, had the *Care of all the Churches*, (*2 Cor.* xi. 28.)

BUT now, I am to accompany this Gentleman, and proceed to what he hath alledged from GENERAL COUNCILS.

He says, ' The first NICENE Council, (Fathers 328) approv'd by Pope *Sylvester*, A.D. 325, decreed, That he who holds the See of *Rome* is the Head and Chief of all the Patriarchs; seeing he is the first, to whom all Power Ecclesiastical is given over all *Christian* Princes, and all their People: And whoever shall contradict this, is Excommunicated by the Synod, Can. 39. — '

Here, instead of authentic Proofs, we have only a Demonstration of the Gentleman's own unwary

unwary Mistakes, or wilful Misrepresentations. Not to insist on that of the Number of the *Fathers* assembled in this Council, (which he reckons to have been 328, instead of 318) he reports it to have been *approv'd* by POPE *Sylvester*; as if this famous General Council had been held, and the Acts of it pass'd, by the *Pope's* Authority: Whereas, all impartial and unprejudiced Authors agree, 1. That this Council was assembled by the express Authority of the EMPEROR *Constantine* the Great, (*Euseb. vita Const. L. iii. C. 6. Socr. L. i. C. 8. Theod. L. i. C. 7. and Sozom. L. i. C. 17.*) which is evident even from their own Synodical Epistle to the Church of *Alexandria*, (*Labb. T. ii. p. 59. Bin. p. 285. and Baron. Ann. 325. N. 117.*) 2, That the Emperor himself was present, sitting on a Throne of Gold, above all the Bishops, as their *President* and *Moderator*; as is testified by *Eusebius*, (*Ibid. C. 10.*) who was a Member of that Council; and confess'd also by *Baronius* himself (*Ann. 325. N. 73.*) And, 3. That when the Canons were made by the Bishops in the Council, the EMPEROR himself ratified the same under his own Seal, (*Euseb. ibid. L. i. C. 37.*) So far is it from being true, that this Council was *approv'd* by Pope *Sylvester*, (as this Gentleman represents it) that none of these ancient Ecclesiastical Historians do so much as mention *Sylvester*, as having had any Hand in the whole Transaction; neither indeed is it agreed, among the several Authors, in what Pope's Time this Council

Council was held. Be that as it will, the learned *Richerius* (though himself a *Romanist*) says, ' It is clear, by undoubted Testimonies, ' that the Appointing, Convening, and Presidency of this Council, depended on the Authority of *Constantine*,' (*Hist. Concil. C. ii. §. 2, &c.*) where he also blames *Baronius* and *Binius*, for wilfully mistaking the *Pope's Consent* (which was requisite only as he was Bishop of an eminent Church) for his *Authority*, to which no Pope in that Age ever pretended. 4. The CANONS here made were in Number no more than Twenty; as is affirm'd by all the *Greeks*, and particularly by *Theodoret* and *Ruffinus*: And it is also confess'd, that when the Sixth Council of *Carthage* (within less than an hundred Years after this) made a diligent Search into the three great Patriarchal Sees of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Constantinople*, they could not find any more than Twenty Canons, (*Lab. T. ii. p. 71. and Bin. p. 395, col. 2.*) Yet, such is the Modesty and boasted *Impartiality* of some zealous Advocates, to serve their own Turn, that) this Gentleman is pleas'd, with great Confidence, to quote a pretended 39th Canon of this Council, (which never was made) to prove a *Popish Supremacy*; and to second the same with a fictitious *Excommunication* of all those who *shall contradict it*; though in flat Opposition to the 6th genuine Canon of that very same Council. For, 5. 'Tis evident from this 6th Canon, that the holy Fathers in this Council had no such Notion of the Bishop of *Rome's* being *the Head*
D
and

and Chief of all the Patriarchs, or his having all Power Ecclesiastical given to him, by Christ, when they expressly confined the Bishop of Rome, as well as the other Patriarchs, within proper Bounds of Jurisdiction, ascribing all his Patriarchal Power unto Custom only, and not to Law Divine; neither is there any one Word, in all the genuine Canons, to give the least Colour to what is here alledged.

Yet he is so confident in his Cause, as to insist also, That ' the first CONSTANTINOPOLITAN Council (Fathers 150) A. D. 381. defined, That St. Peter was Head and Prince of the Apostles; and the Power of loosing and binding Sins was given to St. Peter by our Lord, who, in his Successors, lives and exerciseth Judgment, to this very Time, and always, *Act. 3.*'

Here, (though the Gentleman does not call upon me for it) it may be proper to observe, 1. That this Second General Council was conven'd, held, and confirm'd, by the like Authority as the former, that is, not by the *Papal*, but the IMPERIAL. For not only the ancient *Historians* (*Socr. L. v. C. 8. Sozem. L. vii. C. 7. and Theod. L. v. C. 7*) do expressly prove this: But the *Fathers* themselves, in their Synodical Epistle to the Emperor *Theodosius*, do testify the same; (*Lab. p. 946, and Bin. p. 533.*) and *Richerius* hath fairly clear'd the Point, that *Theodosius* called this General Council by his sole Authority, (*Hist. Concil. L. i. C. v. §. 1, 2.*) And, 'tis plain, the EMPEROR also gave his

his Sanction to their Decrees, at the Request of the Fathers, who desir'd him, by his pious Edict, to confirm the same, (*Labb. and Bin. ubi supra.*) They wrote indeed, afterwards, to *Damasus*, the Bishop of *Rome*; yet not to him alone, but to *Ambrose*, and other Western Bishops with him: And that too, not for any authoritative Confirmation, but to notify to them their Proceedings, so that they might participate with them in their mutual Joy for what they had done, (*Theod. L. v. C. 9.*) From whence 'tis evident, that there may be a *General Council* (as this undoubtedly was) in which the *Pope* is not present, either in Person, or by any Legates, and in which neither he, nor they, have the Honour of presiding. However, 2. 'Tis plain, from the third Canon of this Council, (to which this Gentleman appeals) That *the Bishop of Constantinople should have the Prerogative of Honour, next after the Bishop of Rome*; for this Reason, because (as they express it, on account of the Removal of the Imperial Seat) *Constantinople is New Rome*: Neither is that Expression (of *Next after*) to be understood as any Note of Submission, or Subjection, of the one to the other, but (as it is properly explain'd by *Balsamon*) according to the 28th Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which we are next to consider. Whence therefore this Gentleman could draw the Arguments which he pretends to ground upon this Canon, (so manifestly contrary to the Authority of Holy Scripture, as well as to authentic History

and good Reason) it behoves his Followers to examine.

And now we proceed to what is alledged of ' the CHALCEDON Council, (Fathers 600) Pope ' *Leo* presiding, A. D. 451. In the third Ac- ' tion (of which he says) Pope *Leo* is call'd ' Universal Archbishop of *Old Rome*; and Sen- ' tence is pronounced against *Dioscorus*, in the ' Name of *Leo* and *St. Peter*, to acknowledge ' *Leo* to be *St. Peter's* Successor.'

But, how far this also will come short of proving the Papal Supremacy, may be seen, by observing, 1. That this Council was call'd and held here by the express Authority of the EMPEROR *Marcian*; and that too, not only *with- out*, but AGAINST, THE POPE'S WILL. For, though Pope *Leo* had sent Legates to *Constantinople*, to desire that a General Council might be call'd by the Emperor, and particularly that it might be assembled in *Italy*, if he pleas'd, (*Baron. Ann.* 450, p. 115, *Bin.* p. 18, *Labb.* col. 37, 38, N. 19) Yet *Theodosius*, during his Reign, could not be prevail'd with to call one: And though his Successor, *Marcian*, consented to call such a Council, he would not have it (as the Pope desir'd) in *Italy*, but in the *East*, where the Matters in Controversy began, and therefore, according to the ancient Canons, were to be determin'd. Thus, the EMPEROR summon'd the Bishops at first to meet at *Nice*, (*Marcian*, Ep. N. 36 and 37. *Bin.* p. 29, &c. *Labb.* col. 66, &c.) though he was afterwards pleased to remove them to *Chalcedon*, to which
Place

Place (as being much nearer to him) he also came to them, (*Marc. ibid. N. 41. Bin. p. 32. and Lab. col. 74.*) 2. Neither did Pope *Leo* properly *preside* in it, though he had his Legates there, who sat, as usual, in the Place of him whom they were to represent. But the true *President* was the EMPEROR himself, who, when he was present, sat above all the Bishops; and, in his Absence, his Legates, the Lay-Judges, sat there as his Representatives, (*Act. 1. Bin. p. 34. Labb, col. 88.*) And these, by virtue of the *Imperial* Authority, did not only propound, or allow, what Points were to be debated; but of them also, even the Pope's Legates, as well as the other Bishops, had the *Leave* to speak in their proper Order, (*Act. 4. Bin. p. 336. Lab. col. 518. and Act. 16. Bin. p. 334. Labb. col. 793.*) They summ'd up the Debates, and generally gave the decisive Sentence. 3. As to what this Gentleman alledgeth, out of the third Action, relating to *Dioscorus*, the Truth is, That the whole Cause having been fully heard, and the Judges come to a Determination, in a former Session, so that nothing more remain'd to be done, but for the Bishops to execute the Sentence according to the *Canons*, there was no Occasion for the Emperor, or any of the Lay Judges, to be present: But then the Pope's Legates twice ask'd the Synod's Opinion of the Case; and the whole Synod declared *Dioscorus* to be condemn'd: For, the Legates durst not pronounce the Sentence, 'till they had ask'd, if the *Synod* COMMANDED them to give

the Ecclesiastical Sentence? And then, *by the Order of the Synod*, they first pronounced it; and every Bishop, singly, declared *Dioscorus* Depos'd and Excommunicated, (Act. 3. Bin. p. 192, &c. Labb. col. 421, &c.) But, *the Force of the Sentence depends upon the agreeing Votes of All*: And, we see, *though the Pope had, before, canonically deposed Dioscorus, yet his Sentence was re-examin'd in a General Council*, as is honestly acknowledg'd even by a Cardinal, (*Cusan. de Concord. Cath. L. 2. C. 8.*) In short, the *Sentence* itself, which was publish'd about his Deposition, as well as the Letter written to *Alexandria*, do expressly declare, that he was depos'd and degraded *by the Holy General Council*: And the very same is affirm'd, in their Synodical Epistles to *Marcian* and *Pulcheria*, desiring *them to confirm the Council's Sentence*, (Act. 3. Bin. p. 214, 215, and Labb. col. 460, &c.) Soon after which, when the Council was ended, we find two IMPERIAL Edicts, fully *confirming the Decrees* of this Holy Council, and adding to the latter of them, *Penalties upon all those who would not receive the same*, (Par. 3. Concil. num. 3 and 4. Bin. p. 352, &c. Labb. col. 840, &c.) So that whatsoever Flourishes the modern *Romanists* may invent to entertain their Profelytes with, or wheresoever this Retailer of their Fictions has pick'd up what he says here of Pope *Leo's acknowledg'd Supremacy*, as *St. Peter's Successor*, it is all yain, and impertinently inferr'd from this Case of *Dioscorus*: For, though it was indeed
that

that Popes's Opinion, (before the Council met) that he *ought* to be depos'd ; yet it was the Authority of the *Council*, ratified by the *Emperor*, which actually depos'd him. But, 4. To be somewhat more particular, the pretending to give Pope *Leo* the Title of *Universal* Archbishop of *Old Rome*, is equally false, absurd, and unprecedented. For, it does not appear that *Leo* was honour'd, in the Acts of this Council, with any higher Title, than that (which was not uncommon to those of other great Sees) of *the most Holy Archbishop* *Leo*, (Can. 30.) But, for the other Title of *Universal*, it was so far from being granted, or allow'd, to any Pope, or other Bishop, in those first Ages, that when it was, long afterwards, assum'd, or pretended to, it was loudly censur'd and condemn'd, as profane, blasphemous, and *Antichristian*, as I shall have occasion to prove hereafter. And, lastly, to demonstrate, that the Bishops in this Council were far from *acknowledging* any Thing like an *Universal Supremacy* in him, or any other, is evident, from their 28th Canon ; wherein, though they follow the Decrees of the Fathers, and honour *Old Rome*, as the Imperial City, yet at the same Time, they recognize and confirm the 3d Canon of *Constantinople* (before-mention'd) which gave the City of *Constantinople* (which was then become *New Rome*) equal Privileges with the other : *Rightly judging, that the City, which is the Seat of Empire, and of a Senate, and is equal to the old Empress Rome, in other Privileges, should be so also in*

Ecclesiastical Concerns, as being the Second, and next after her, (Bin. T. 3. p. 446, 447,) that is to say, in point of Precedency only, not of any other Privilege. For, if these holy Fathers had believ'd, that there was any such Supreme Authority, as is now pretended to, given by *Christ* to the Bishop of *Rome*, they undoubtedly would never have oppos'd him; and much less have thus given their Saction to the Grant of EQUAL PRIVILEGES to any other. But, it is manifest to all rational Men, that the ancient Fathers did not ascribe the Honour of Precedency to the Bishop of *Rome*, on account of his sitting in *St. Peter's* Chair, or under pretence of his being *Christ's Vicar*, but only because he had his Seat in the Imperial City, as the Bishop of *Constantinople* now had his.

Here the Gentleman stops, to take a little Breath, and says, ' So much for the first three General Councils; and now let us hear what the Fathers say.' In the mean time it is proper to take Notice of another Defect, either in his Memory or Understanding, where he calls these *the first three* General Councils. But this may pass as one of the least considerable of his Mistakes; though every one, who has had any Acquaintance with the General Councils, must know that there was one held at *Ephesus*, A. D. 431, (twenty Years before this at *Chalcedon*) which is therefore always call'd the *Third*, and this the *Fourth*, General Council; of which see more hereafter.

Now,

Now, as to what he alledgeth out of the FATHERS, every Body knows, how easy it is for an artful Collector to pick and cull, out of many voluminous Writings, some unconnected Expressions, which may be occasionally strain'd, wrested, and applied to a Sense, which the Author himself never meant or thought of. But, he must have a new Art of *Logic*, peculiar to himself, who can propose, and insist upon, an Argument, drawn from meer Rhetorical Florishes, or other accidental Phrases, as of any Weight in the Scale of Truth, to prove St. *Peter's* Supremacy, and that of the Bishops of *Rome*, as his Successors, in plain Contradiction to the whole Tenor and Analogy of Holy Scripture, as well as of the Series of History, both sacred and profane; wherein it expressly appears, that none of the other Apostles, nor even St. *Peter* himself, nor any of his pretended Successors in several of the first Ages, ever acknowledged, claimed, or thought of, any such a thing. But, let us hear what he would be at. He says,

' In the first Age, St. DENNIS, the *Areopagite*, affirms, that he and *Timothy* were both present at the Blessed Virgin *Mary's* Death; and there was also present both *James* the Brother of our Lord, and *Peter*, supream and antient Top of Divines. He is cited by St. *John Damascen*. Orat. 2.

A Top Argument this indeed! But where is its Authority, if the Books now extant under his Name were not written by him, (as is own'd to

to be much doubted by some Men of Note, even in the *Roman* Communion, (*Sixt. Senens. Bibl. L. 6. Annot. 229. and Bin. p. 336, col. 2.*) but of a much later Age? However, 'tis remarkable, that this Author (whoever he was) calls the *Decad of the Apostles co-ordinate with their Foreman, St. Peter.* (*Dionys. de Eccl. Hier. C. 5.*) And though he treats at large about the Degrees of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and of *Episcopacy as the first and highest of Divine Orders, in which the Hierarchy is consummated, (ibid.)* He says not a Word of any *Papal Supremacy*, or any other. So that this Gentleman might, as properly and pertinently, have vouched their fabulous Legend of *St. Dennis* (carrying his own Head in his Hand, for the Space of two Miles; after it was cut off!) as what he has here gravely alledged from those spurious Writings, in favour of an usurped Supremacy.

‘ In the second Age, *St. Irenæus*, (is called to prove that) all Churches round about, ought to resort to the *Roman Church*, by reason of her most powerful Principality, (*L. iii. C. 3.*) And again, The *Roman Church* is the greatest, and most antient, founded at *Rome*, by *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, (*L. iii. Valent. C. 3.*)’

Here, it might be sufficient to reply, 1. That the most powerful Principality might properly enough be ascribed to *Rome*, in respect of its being then the only Imperial Seat; and other Churches might well resort to the same, on Account of the Integrity of the Christian Faith, which

which was then professed there, though without any Respect to the Universality of the *Roman* Jurisdiction and Dominion now pretended to. And, 2. That since the *Roman* Church is here acknowledged to have been *founded* by *St. Peter* AND *St. Paul*, this can be no rational Proof of a *Supremacy* in the one, more than in the other. But, 3. Where it is called the MOST ANTIEN, the Author is guilty of a notorious Fallacy : For as the *Romanists* themselves affirm, that *St. Peter* was the Founder and Bishop of *Antioch*, before that was founded at *Rome* ; so we have good historical Proof of a *Christian* Church planted even in this our Isle of *Britain* also before it. (*Gild. de Excid. Brit. p. 11.*) However, we have the infallible Authority of Holy Scripture itself to prove, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was before any of them, according to the Prophecy ; (*Isa. ii. 3.*) which therefore being the *most antient*, has the best Title to be the MOTHER CHURCH OF ALL. And, 4. It is plain, from *St. Irenæus*, his own Conduct, that he did not believe either the Papal Supremacy or Infallibility, when he, with a Synod of the Bishops of *France* under his Jurisdiction, not only took upon them to expostulate (so freely as they did) with Pope *Victor*, and to admonish him, in relation to his rash Proceedings in the Controversy about keeping *Easter* ; but declared themselves nevertheless to hold Communion with the *Asian* Bishops, whom that Pope had *excommunicated*. (*Euseb. L. v. C. 24. p. 152.*)

The

The next of the Fathers, here produced, is in the third Age, ORIGEN; when (he says) 'the chief Choice of *feeding Christ's Sheep* was given to St. *Peter*, and the Church founded upon him, C. 6. Epist. ad *Roman*.'

This requires no other Reply, than what is already remark'd, upon the foregoing Arguments, alledg'd from the Holy *Scriptures*. However, he explains his Meaning, where he says, *If you think the whole Church to be only built on Peter alone, what will you say of John, the Son of Thunder, and of EACH of the Apostles? &c.* (in *Matth.* xvi. p. 275.)

'In the same Age, St. CYPRIAN (is also introduced, saying) We hold *Peter* the Head of the Church, (Epist. ad *Julian*.) And in another Place, he calls the Church of *Rome* St. *Peter's Chair*, Epist. 55.'

Here, I must observe, that, among the Epistles of St. *Cyprian*, there is none address'd to *Julian*, or any other like that Name: And, if it was only the Writer's Blunder, meaning that to *Jubaianus*, it betrays no less *Fallacy*; since there are no such Words to be found, in that long Epistle, as are here pretendedly quoted.

But, it is plain, he must be a great Stranger to the Writings of this learned Father, or else an egregious Falsifier, who, from these, or the like casual Expressions, would pretend to vouch St. *Cyprian's* Authority, in Favour of the Papal Supremacy. For, with what *Brotherly Familiarity* and Freedom does He always address the several *Popes*, his Contemporaries; calling them
(without

(without any suppos'd Distinction of Superiority, but in plain Terms of EQUALITY) *his Brother Cornelius! his Brother Lucius! and his Brother Stephen!* How clearly does He explain those (before cited) Words of our Lord to *Peter*, contrary to the modern Notion of Supremacy; where he says, *Our Lord gave the SAME POWER TO ALL his Apostles: The other Apostles were, in truth, what Peter was; entitled to an EQUAL Share with him of Dignity and Power; but, I say, the Process began with One, that the Church might be consider'd as one,* (Unity of the Church, § 3.) And, as the Title of POPE was not, in those Days, thought peculiar to the Successors of *St. Peter*, but given here, indifferently and frequently, to *Cyprian* (the Bishop of *Carthage*) even by the Clergy of *Rome* itself, as well as to their own Bishops; so does He call the Bishop of *Rome* expressly HIS COLLEAGUE, (Epist. ix.) thereby denoting such an Equality, as between Consuls, or Tribunes, or Sheriffs, or any other joint Administrators of one and the same Office. To which if we add, how freely he censured *the Pride and Impertinence* of Pope *Stephen's* Proceedings, (Epist. lxxiv.) and the Dislike which he express'd against any other Bishop's assuming to himself such a dictatorial Authority over those of his own Order, as to be *a Bishop of Bishops*, (Conc. *Carthag.* A. D. 256.) which plainly shews his Opinion, (as *Dupin* well observes) that *the Bishop of Rome ought not to assume any Authority over the rest of the Bishops that are*
his

his Brethren, or over their Churches, it must be absurd to conclude, that this great Prelate could ever once think, that *St. Peter* himself was *the Head of the Church*, or that there was such a Succession of Supremacy in *St. Peter's Chair*, as is here pretended.

The next is, that, 'in the fourth Age, *St. BASIL* calls *St. Peter* That Blessed One, who 'was preferr'd before the rest of the Apostles. 'Serm. *de Judicio Dei*.'

But what the *Preference* was, and how far short of such a Supremacy as is now contended for, may be fairly submitted to the unprejudiced Reader's Judgment, upon the Remarks already made on the foregoing Arguments: And so may most of those which here follow. However, to be somewhat more particular, this *Father's* Judgment is clear in the main Point, where he says, *Christ* conferr'd to ALL Pastors and Teachers, continually afterward, an EQUAL Power (of feeding his Sheep) whereof it is a Sign, that *all do, in like manner, bind and loose*, (*Basil. Const. Mon. C. 22.*)

'In the same Age, *St. ATHANASIUS*, (is 'quoted, saying,) Thou art *Peter*: Upon 'thy Foundation, Pillars of the Church, that 'is, the Bishops, are fortified. Epist. ad '*Felicem*.'

Whether these are the Words of *St. Athanasius*, and fairly quoted, I have neither Opportunity nor Leisure, at present, to examine. Be that as it will, they are so obscure, as hardly to require any special Consideration, after what
has

has been said of that Case in general. Yet it may be worthy of a Remark, that this same great Patriarch, who by his own Authority would hold Councils of all his comprovincial Bishops at *Alexandria* (as he did) without taking the least Notice of the Pope, and who (as *Nazianzen* expresseth it) *did, in this Synod, give Laws TO THE WHOLE WORLD*, (*Bar. Ann. 362. To. 4. p. 66, 73. Labb, p. 809. Bin. p. 487. col. 1.*) cannot reasonably be call'd an Asserter of the Papal Supremacy and paramount Jurisdiction over the whole Church.

' In the same Age, St. EPIPHANIUS, (saying) He chose *Peter*, Captain of his Disciples. *Hæres. 51.*

Yet, he says elsewhere, (*Hæres. 78.*) that St. *James* did first receive the Episcopal Chair, and to him our Lord did first intrust his own Throne upon Earth; which is plainly inconsistent with any Notion of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, as *Christ's Vicar*, or the Captain of his Disciples.

' In the same Age, St. CYRIL, of *Jerusalem* (thus) *Peter*, the Prince, (saith he) and ' most excellent of all the Apostles. *Catech. 2.*

But, when the same Father calls St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, in express Terms, the *Patrons, or Presidents of the Church*, (*Catech. 6.*) what can he mean, upon the whole, but that they were equal to one another in Honour, and neither of them superior to the other, in point of Jurisdiction?

‘ In the same Age, St. CHRYSOSTOME (say-
 ing) The Pastor, and Head of the Church,
 ‘ was once a poor Fisherman. Homil 55, in
 ‘ *Matthæum*.’

And, what can this amount to, when we
 meet with the same great Father frequently
 elsewhere expressing himself thus: *What was*
greater than Peter; and what equal to Paul?
 (To. v. Orat. 167,) — *They (the Apostles) were*
ALL in common, intrusted with the whole World,
and had the Care of all Nations. (Ibid. Orat.
 4. and T. viii. p. 115.) — *St. Paul sheweth,*
that each Apostle did enjoy EQUAL Dignity, (in
 Gal. ii. 8.) — *Upon this Rock; he said not upon*
Peter: For he did not build his Church upon the
Man, but upon HIS FAITH. (To. v. Orat.
 163.) — *St. James did preside over all the Jewish*
Believers. (Ibid. Orat. 59.) — *St. John was a*
Pillar of the Churches through the World; he
that had the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,
 (in John i. 1.) — *St. Paul was the Tongue, the*
Teacher, the Apostle of the World: He had the
whole World put into his Hands, and took care
thereof; and had committed to him all Men
dwelling upon Earth, (in 1 Cor. ix. 2.) — *None*
was greater than He; yea, none equal to him.
 (To. vi. Orat. 9.)

Now, from these, and numberless more Ex-
 pressions of the like Sort, we may perceive, that
 those Titles of *Captain, Prince, Head, &c.*
 are but made use of as meer hyperbolical Flou-
 rishes of Oratory, and of no more Force to
 prove any Supremacy of St. Peter over the rest
 of

of the Apostles, than *Cicero's* calling *Socrates* the Prince of Philosophers, and *Sulpitius* the Prince of all Lawyers, was, to prove the one of these to have had a supreme Government and Jurisdiction over all the *Philosophers*, and the other over all the *Lawyers*. Neither did these very *Fathers* here cited, nor any other of those in the primitive Ages, mean any more, by all their Flights of Rhetoric, than only so many Commendations of St. *Peter's* Apostolical Office, or of his personal Merits, without any comparative Relation to the rest of the Apostles: Nor indeed did the Words themselves properly import such a Superiority, but an Eminency among them, in Worth, Merit, Apostolical Performances, or, at most, in the Order of Precedency. And, for the right Understanding thereof, we ought therefore to observe *Tertullian's* Rule, (*Ad Prax.* C. 3.) rather to apply ourselves *to the Sense of the Things, than to the Sound of the Words.* But, to proceed;

' In the same Age, OECUMENIUS, (says) Not *James*, but *Peter* riseth, as being both more fervent, and also the President of the Disciples, in C. i. Actorum.'

This refers to the Designation of a new Apostle, to supply the Place of *Judas*: But in that whole Case, there is no Colour or Pretence of a Supremacy. All that *Peter* did, was as one of the Number, to declare the Occasion of their Meeting, and to suggest the Matter to them: But THEY (the Disciples) and not he alone, appointed the Two, of whom *Mat-*

thias was chosen by *Lot*, upon *their Prayer to the Lord* to make *his Choice*, (*Acts* i. 23, &c.) And the like is evident also, in the Institution of the *Deacons*; wherein the whole Authority was expressly in THE TWELVE, and not in *Peter*, or any other of them alone, (*Acts* vi. 2.) But, as to his being *President* in any other Sense, the contrary is manifest, from what is observ'd before upon the great Council at *Jerusalem*, (*Acts* xv.)

' In the same Age, OPTATUS MILEVITANUS (says) in this Chair sat *Peter*, the ' Head of the Apostles, 1. 2. *contra Parmen.*

But he says, *Peter* did alone receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, *to be communicated to the rest*, (L. 7.) that is, (as *Rigaltius* well expounds it) *which Christ himself would also communicate TO THE REST*, (*Rigalt.* in *Cypr. de Unit. Eccl.*) And, as to the Honour paid to St. PETER'S CHAIR, it has been already accounted for, in the foregoing Remarks upon the *Canons*. However, so far was this Father from pretending to make Communion with *Rome* the sole, or principal, Note of a *Catholic*, that he expressly insists on the Necessity of being in Communion with ALL OTHER Orthodox Churches, among whom he particularly mentions *the seven Churches of Asia*, (*Optat.* L. 2. p. 50.)

' In the same Age, EUSEBIUS EMISSENUS (says) He (*Christ*) first committed his *Lambs*, ' afterwards his *Sheep*, to *Peter*, because he ' (was)

* (was) made, not Pastor, but Pastor of Pastors.
 ' Serm. de Nativ. S. Jo.'

Upon which there needs nothing to be added here, after what has been herein-before remark'd upon this Text; though the Credit of that Book is very doubtful.

' In the same Age St. AMBROSE (says) *Andrew* first followed our Saviour; yet *Andrew* received not the Primacy, but *Peter*, in ' 2 Cor xii.'

But, here it must be observ'd, that what he says of *Peter's* Primacy, he explains to be meant of a *Primacy of Confession, not of Honour; of Faith, not of Order*, (de Incarn. C. 4.) And again, he says, *ALL THE BISHOPS have in St. Peter received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, (de Dign. Sac. 1.) Yea, that St. *Paul* was *EQUAL* to St. *Peter*, (in Gal. ii.)

And, last of all, 'tis urg'd, that, 'in the fifth Age, St. AUGUSTIN, speaking of *Peter's* Penance, says, *He cures the whole Body's Disease in the very Head of the Church*, (Serm. 12. de 4 temporibus.) And again, *Peter, the Head of the Apostles; the Gate-keeper of Heaven, and the Foundation of the Church*, (Epist. 86.) And, in another Place, — *Of whom Peter the Apostle, by reason of his Primacy, Apostleship*, Tract. ult. in Joann.'

But, at the same Time, 'tis observable, that he declares, *When it is said to Peter, it is said TO ALL, Feed my Sheep*, (de Agone Christi, C. 30.) as I noted on that Text before. — *Our Lord gave the Power to Peter, as a Type of*

Unity, (de Bapt. 3. 17.) — Not without Cause does Peter, AMONG THE REST of the Apostles, sustain the Person of the Catholic Church; for to this Church are the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given, when they are given unto Peter, (de Agone Christi C. 30. in Psa. 108.) — And indeed, Brethren, that which a Pastor is, he gave also to his Members; for, both Peter was a Pastor, and Paul a Pastor, and THE REST of the Apostles were Pastors, and good Bishops are Pastors, (in Job. tr. 47.)

So much, I presume, may well suffice, by way of Reply to what the Gentleman has here alledged out of the *Fathers of the first five Centuries*; wherein I have shew'd, that the several Passages he has selected, (supposing them to be fairly quoted, and allowing them all the Force and Authority that can reasonably be required) are either inconsistent with the genuine Sense and Meaning of the Authors themselves from whom they are occasionally pick'd and cull'd, or at best inconclusive, and nothing to the Purpose, for which he has taken the Liberty to press them to serve his precarious *Hypothesis*.

But now, before we proceed, let us see what Use the Gentleman would have made of these his select Vouchers.

*Thus far (says he) from Councils and Fathers;
from whence I draw this Conclusion:*

‘ If three General Councils, and the Fathers
‘ of the first five Centuries, did define, teach,
‘ and believe, that St. *Peter*, and his Successors,
‘ were Supream Head of the Church, then it
‘ was

‘ was universally acknowledg’d in this Nation,
 ‘ and all others, and was not usurp’d.

‘ But the three General Councils, and the
 ‘ Fathers of the first five Centuries, did define,
 ‘ teach, and believe, that *St. Peter*, and his
 ‘ Successors, were Supream Head of the Church.

‘ Therefore, it was acknowledg’d, in this
 ‘ Nation, and all others, and not usurp’d.

‘ Of which (says he) the Major is proved
 ‘ from the *Consent of our Adversaries*; who
 ‘ grant, that, for the first five Centuries, the
 ‘ Church had not err’d: And the Minor is
 ‘ prov’d from the above Citations of Councils and
 ‘ Fathers.’

But, for all his *Logic*, it does not appear to
 me, that either his *Major*, or *Minor*, are suf-
 ficiently prov’d, from whence he pretends to
 draw this Conclusion. For,

First, As to the *Major*; whatever might be
 defined, taught, and believed, by three General
 Councils, and some of the Fathers of the first five
 Centuries, cannot be a Proof that the same was
 UNIVERSALLY ACKNOWLEDG’D in those Days.
 For, as there was another General Council, and
 many more Fathers also than those he has here
 cited, within the first five Centuries, it is a gross
 Fallacy, to draw such a Conclusion of an univer-
 sal Acknowledgment, without a plain Proof that
 they had ALL agreed in the same: And, ’till
 he is able to prove, that all were universally
 agreed in the same Acknowledgment, within the
 same Period of Time, it will be impertinent
 to insist upon what he calls the *Consent of Ad-*
versaries;

versaries ; and needless to examine, whether, and by whom, it has been *granted*, that, *for the first five Centuries, the Church had not err'd.*

And, *Secondly*, The *Minor* also must be denied. For, neither did the *three General Councils and the Fathers*, whom he himself has here cited, *define, teach, and believe* what he would fain extort from them, (as I have shew'd already ;) and much less did all those of *the first five Centuries* agree in an *universal Acknowledgment* of the same, to support his extraordinary *Conclusion*, which will be taken Notice of in its proper Place.

Now, though I am not under any Obligation here to go through the whole Series of the *General Councils and the Fathers* within that Period of Time, I shall yet enter so far into the same, as to produce more abundant Evidence of this Gentleman's fallacious Argument.

And, first, as to the COUNCILS ; it is well known, that the third General Council was that held at EPHESUS, A. D. 431, (as I have noted before) which this Gentleman has pass'd over without any Mention. But, for what Reason he did not think it worthy of his Notice, I cannot see ; since 'tis evidently to his Purpose, as much as either of the other ; that is, indeed, Nothing at all for the Papal Supremacy. For, 1. When *Nestorius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, began to broach his Heresy, he was learnedly oppos'd by *Cyril*, Bishop of *Alexandria* : And though the latter was seconded by *Celestine* of *Rome*, and other Western Bishops, they

they found it necessary to desire the EMPEROR to call a General Council at *Ephesus*, in order to the more authentic and effectual Examination of the Cause. 2. The Emperor (*Theodosius* the Younger) thereupon issued his Edicts, prefixing the Time and Place of their Meeting; and declaring, that whoever absented himself *should not be excused*, (*Bin. p. 164. & Labb. col. 436.*) In Obedience to whose COMMAND the Council assembled; as is evident from their own Acknowledgment in general, as well as that of the *Pope* himself and his Legates in particular, (*Bin. p. 168 — 236, and Labb. col. 445 — 626.*) 3. When they were met, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, in right of his See, was President of the Council, together with *Memnon*, the Bishop of the Place. For, the Patriarch of *Rome* not being present, and he of *Constantinople* the Person under Censure, the Third was of course the Principal there, (*Bin. p. 295, and Labb. col. 763, &c.*) and is, accordingly, with *Memnon*, called *the Head of the Council*, (*Bin. p. 304, and Labb. col. 786.*) And now they proceed, to pronounce and subscribe the solemn Sentence, of deposing and excommunicating *Nestorius*, (*Bin. p. 204, and Labb. col. 533.*) without waiting for the *Pope's* Legates, who did not come to *Ephesus* 'till the three Sessions of the first Act were over: And yet their Absence was never objected, as if that had render'd the Process invalid. Neither was the Sentence pronounced in the *Pope's* Name, but thus, *Our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he hath Blasphemed,*

doth, by this Holy Council, decree, that Nestorius shall be depriv'd of his Episcopal Dignity, and shall be excluded out of the Communion of Bishops, (*Bin. & Labb. ut supra.*) But, 4. Whatever complimentary Titles may be now given to, or claim'd by, the Popes, 'tis plain, from the Acts of this Council, that Nestorius treats Celestine upon Terms of EQUALITY, and says, he will converse with him, *as one Brother useth to do with another*, (*Cap. 16. Bin. p. 133. Labb. col. 349, &c. and Baron. Ann. 430. p. 530.*) And, though Cyril salutes him with the Title of his LORD, (*Cap. 21. Bin. p. 144. and Labb. col. 377.*) he at the same Time calls John of Antioch also his Lord,, *beloved Brother, and Fellow-Minister*, (*ibid.*) in the very same Terms as he mentions Pope Celestine himself, in an Epistle to Juvenalis, Bishop of Jerusalem, (*Cap. 24. Bin. p. 147. and Labb. col. 388.*) Yea, so far are these, and the like Titles, from being any Proof (as the Pope's Parasites would have them to be) of a Supremacy, that we may see the same Patriarch, Cyril, calling Acacius, the Bishop of Beræa, *his Lord*, (*Cap. 22. Bin. p. 145. and Labb. col. 381.*) And John of Antioch also bestowing the same Title upon the Bishop of Mindus, a very small City, as well as upon the great Patriarch of Constantinople, (*Cap. 25. Bin. p. 150. and Labb. col. 393.*) By the like way of arguing, they might therefore as fairly conclude a Supremacy, here, over the See of Canterbury, from this Primate's saluting any one of his Suffragans in the usual Style

Style of MY LORD! And, after all, 5. As this General Council was conven'd by the *Imperial* Authority, so were their Acts confirm'd by the same Royal Sanction. For, notwithstanding all the groundless Assertions of the *Romish* Agents, in this and the like Cases, to the contrary, 'tis evident, that *Sozomen* expressly says, that *the Emperor, by his Suffrage, confirmed their Acts*, (*Soz. Hist. L. 7. C. 9. p. 419*) And *Binius* also grants, that the Emperor dismiss'd the Bishops, and decreed, that *the Sentence of this holy General Council against Nestorius should stand in full Force*, (*Bin. Not. p. 483. and Labb. col. 1251.*)

THUS have I fairly stated all the four GENERAL COUNCILS which were held within the first five Centuries; and cannot find the least Ground for a Proof of such a Papal Supremacy as is now contended for: Neither need I stop here, if it were not beyond the Bounds of our present Inquiry; since their own Cardinal *Cusanus*, among others, will testify, That *the Authority of a Council doth not depend upon the Pope: Because, if so, we should disannul the Authority of the EIGHT first General Councils; which were appointed by EMPERORS, when the Pope of Rome, in like Manner as the other Patriarchs, received a public ORDER, by Letters missive, for coming, or sending, to the Councils*, (*Cusan. Concord. Cath. L. 2. C. 25.*)

And as to the FATHERS, though I have already shew'd how vainly those few have been call'd upon, whom the Gentleman has here endeavour'd

deavour'd to force into his Service, it is no small Disparagement to his Cause, that among so many famous Authors, who flourish'd in those primitive Ages, he could not produce any one clear Testimony or Acknowledgment that St. *Peter*, and his Successors, were Supreme Head of the Church. Had this been capable of Proof, we might reasonably have expected some Evidence from the Writings or Actions of St. *Clemens* of *Rome*, St. *Ignatius* of *Antioch*, St. *Polycarp* of *Smyrna*, St. *Justin* the Martyr, and *Tertullian* of *Carthage*, (all within the two first Centuries;) St. *Firmilian* of *Cæsarea*, St. *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, St. *Jerome*, and many more, whom it would be needless (and therefore tiresome) here to enumerate, within the first five Centuries.

Now, that St. CLEMENS, though Bishop of *Rome*, was not conscious of any such universal Supremacy, as is now pretended to by the Successors in that Chair, is evident, from his famous Epistle to the *Corinthians*; wherein he is so far from lording it over God's Heritage, that he modestly writes it in the Name of the whole Church of *Rome*, without so much as once mentioning himself, and much less insinuating any such Thing as an infallible Judge of Controversies, invested with a Supreme Authority, from which there lay no Appeal. But indeed, nothing can be more absurd than to talk of a Supremacy in that See, within this first Century, unless we could pretend a Supremacy in any
of

of the *Successors* of *St. Peter*, over *St. John* himself, who was yet alive.

When *St. IGNATIUS*, Bishop of *Antioch*, was condemn'd to his Martyrdom at *Rome*, we might have expected an Account of some Distinction of Respects paid by him (if any such had been due) to the then Pope, in virtue of the now pretended Supremacy: But, tho' we read of the *Christians* at *Rome* resorting to him, on his Arrival there, and his pious Exhortations to them in general, we see not the least Intimation of any Supreme Authority in the *Pope*, either on that Occasion, or in any of the Epistles which he had written to the several other Churches, for their better Order and Establishment in the Faith.

When *St. POLYCARP*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, came to *Rome*, about the Paschal Controversy, his Business was not to acknowledge any Superiority in Pope *Anicetus*; but to confer with him, in order to settle the Difference between the Eastern and Western Churches, about the proper Time of keeping *Easter*. And, though they were equally tenacious of their own Customs, so that neither of them could convince the other, yet they communicated together, and parted in mutual Terms of brotherly Love and Friendship. Which is the more remarkable, because both Sides pleaded Apostolical Authority, (that of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* on the one Side, and that of *St. John* and *St. Philip* on the other;) and yet no Pretence of Supremacy was then offer'd to be set up by either.

And,

And, when the same Controversy was afterwards reviv'd, with great Violence, by Pope *Victor*, not only *Irenæus*, (beforemention'd) but *Polycrates*, Bishop of *Ephesus*, and divers others, in several Parts, held Provincial Synods, and slighted his Censures: And even those, who yet agreed with him in the main Question, blam'd him very sharply, for his pretending imperiously to impose his Customs upon other Churches, in breach of the *Christian* Peace and Unity.

When *JUSTIN*, the Martyr, wrote his famous Apology at *Rome*, in Defence of the *Christians*, wherein he set forth the Divinity of their Faith, and the Innocency of their Rites and religious Assemblies, we find not a Word (though he had a fair Occasion to speak) in favour of *St. Peter's* Supremacy, and that of his *Successors*.

As for *TERTULLIAN*, 'tis plain, he was so far from acknowledging any such Supremacy, that, when he was, by Pope *Zephyrin*, cut off from Communion with the Church of *Rome*, he smartly reflected upon that Usurpation; calling the Pope, ironically, *Bishop of Bishops*, as taking upon him to domineer over the whole *Christian* Church! in the same Sense as *St. Cyprian* afterwards apply'd the same Phrase to Pope *Stephen*, in the Council of *Carthage*.

Nor did *FIRMILIAN*, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, treat the same Pope with less Freedom on the same Account, as appears from his Epistle to *St. Cyprian*; wherein he chargeth *Stephen* with
Arro-

Arrogance and *Inhumanity*, for Excommunicating those who differ'd from his Sentiments; expresseth his *Indignation at the manifest Absurdity of Stephen's Conduct*; declares that, by so doing, he had only *Excommunicated Himself*: calls him a *Schismatic*; and actually compares him to JUDAS!

HILARY, Bishop of *Poictiers*, called several Councils in *France*, concerning the Catholic Faith, and particularly one at *Paris*: And tho' the Synodical Epistle thereof is still extant, the Name of the Pope is not so much as mention'd in it.

St. JEROME was so far from pinning his Faith upon *Rome*, or acknowledging its Supremacy, that he declares, he *would follow NO CHIEF but Christ*, (*Baron. Ann. 372. p. 281, 282.*) And expressly, that *the Consent of many Churches is of greater Authority, than that of the Roman alone*, (*ibid. Ann. 402. p. 160.*)

But, why should I mention Particulars, when 'tis the common consentient Evidence of all the Fathers, within *the first five Centuries*, that all the Apostles Successors, as such, were so far upon Terms of Equality, that *wheresoever a Bishop be, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, at Alexandria, or at Thanis, he is of the same Worth, and of the same Priesthood: The Force of Wealth, and Lowness of Poverty, doth not render a Bishop more high, or more low; for that ALL OF THEM are Successors of the Apostles*,
(*Hier.*

(*Hier. ad Evagr. Ep. 85. Clem. ad Corinth. Iren. 3. 12, 3. 1, 3.*)

From all which, I presume, the Truth of my *second Proposition* is made sufficiently evident, *viz.* 'That no such Supremacy, as is now asserted, in the Popes, or Bishops of *Rome*, over all the Christian Church, was acknowledged, or pretended to, in several Ages after the Propagation of Christianity.'

AND now 'tis Time to proceed also to the Proof of the *Third*, *viz.* 'That the MEANS by which they first gained any Acknowledgment of such an Universal Supremacy, were neither lawful nor warrantable; but, from Time to Time, controverted and oppos'd, as Usurpations.'

In order to which, there will not be any occasion for more than a fair Appeal to plain Matter of Fact. For,

DURING the first three Centuries, before Christianity was embraced by the reigning Emperors, the whole Church being subject to various Discouragements, and almost in a continual State of Persecution, the Bishops of *Rome* could have no Temptation to affect any Supremacy over their Brethren: Their chief Concern was to feed their respective Flocks with the sincere Milk of the Word; to set before them the Light of an exemplary Life and Conversation; and to practise the Evangelical Doctrines of Passive Obedience to the higher Powers, and mutual Love, Charity, and Unity among themselves. But, when the Emperors became Christian,

Christian, the Church put on a new Face, and began to be settled in a better Order; so that, to accommodate the Places and Precedencies of the Bishops among themselves, the Honours of the Church were made to follow the Honours of the State. Thus, the Bishop of *Rome*, having his Residence in the Imperial City, was allow'd a Priority in point of Precedency, though not a Superiority in Government and Jurisdiction; all the Difference then being only Honorary, not Authoritative.

For some Time, the Bishop of *Rome*, as well as the rest, continued in due Obedience to the Emperor, patiently enduring his Censures, and submitting to his Judgments: So that, though he was chosen by the Clergy and People of his own District, he waited for the Emperor's Ratification of that Choice.

But, when all *Italy* was in Confusion, and *Rome* itself closely besieg'd by the *Lombards*, so that none could be sent out, as usual, to procure the Emperor's Assent to the Election of *Pelagius II.* to the then vacant See, (*A. D.* 579.) that Prelate was under a Necessity to enter upon the Popedom, contrary to the Example of his Predecessors, without waiting for the Imperial Sanction: Yet, so soon as a Passage was open'd from thence to the Court, *Gregory* (then a Deacon, but afterwards his Successor in the Papal Chair) was dispatch'd on an Embassy to the Emperor, on purpose to represent the Necessity of the Case, and make a proper Apology for it, (*Plat. & Onuphr. in vitâ Pelag. ii.*)

Much

Much about this Time, *John*, the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, began to affect that ambitious Title of UNIVERSAL BISHOP, (*Onupr. in vitâ Bonif. iii.*) In which, though he is said to have had the Countenance of the Emperor *Mauritius*, he was severely oppos'd therein both by Pope *Pelagius*, and his Successor *Gregory*. And, that this Opposition was not only against the Person, but against the Thing itself, is evident from the Terms in which St. *Gregory* declaims against it; calling it *a novel, singular, erroneous, impious and blasphemous Title, the universal Pest of the Church, the Corruption of the Faith, contrary to the Canons, contrary to St. Peter the Apostle, contrary to the Sense of the Gospel, contrary to all Churches, and contrary even to God himself*, (*Greg. I. L. iv. Ep. 32. 34. 38. 39.*) declaring also, that whosoever should assume that Title to himself would be THE FORE-RUNNER OF ANTICHRIST, (*ibid. Ep. 78.*) and that *none of his Predecessors did ever consent to the Use of such a profane Title as this!* (*ibid. Ep. 36. and L. vi. Ep. 24.*) Yet, notwithstanding this so just a Censure, it was not long after, that this very *profane* Title was assum'd by one of his own Successors.

For, *Phocas*, a fierce and bloody Tyrant, having trayterously murder'd the Emperor *Mauritius*, and usurp'd his Throne, *Boniface III.* partly by his own vile Insinuations, and partly by the Usurper's Hatred to *Cyriacus*, (the then Patriarch of *Constantinople*) easily prevailed with *Phocas* to ordain, that *the See of Rome should be*

be held to be absolutely the chief Seat, to which all other Churches should be obedient; that the Bishops thereof should be the only UNIVERSAL Bishops; and that Boniface himself should be THE HEAD of all other Bishops, and have the Prerogative above them; notwithstanding this was, confessedly, contrary to the Custom of his Predecessors, (*Masson. in vitâ Bonif. 3. Blondi. Decad. i. apud Osiandr. p. 255. Polyd. Virg. Inv. rerum, L. iv. C. 9. p. 271. Baron. Ann. 606. n. 1, &c.*)

Such were THE MEANS, by which the Papal Supremacy first gained any Colour of Acknowledgment: And though these were plainly neither lawful nor warrantable, yet the succeeding Popes, from Time to Time, made their own Advantage of such unprecedented and *Antichristian* Grants, by further Encroachments and Usurpations, in the Days of other wicked or weak Princes, tho' not without great Controversy and Opposition, as Occasion offer'd; which is sufficient to make good my *Third Proposition*.

BUT now, to bring the Point in Controversy nearer Home, the *Fourth Proposition* is, 'That in this Island (particularly) neither the Pope's Supremacy, nor the other Doctrines of modern Popery, (by which it is distinguish'd from the true Church of *England*) ever had any uncontroverted Establishment or Authority.'

And here I must take notice of a Passage, in the Conclusion of the last-mention'd *Syllogism*, which I reserved to speak of in its proper

Place: This Gentleman there, from Premises unfairly stated, and wretchedly misapplied, (as I have already prov'd) pretended to infer, that the Supremacy of *St. Peter*, and his Successors, was universally acknowledg'd, *in this Nation and all others, and not usurp'd*; tho' he seems, at the same Time, to be conscious of the Fallacy: For he presently recollects himself, and says, *But the Gentleman will reply, that THIS NATION, in particular, did not acknowledge the Pope's Supremacy: To which (says he) I answer;*

' If this Nation did not acknowledge the Pope's Supremacy, then she was not in Communion with the Church, in the first five Centuries.

' But, she was in Communion with the Church in the first five Centuries, as appears by her Representatives being universally received at the Councils of *Arles, Sardica, and Ariminum*: Therefore she did acknowledge the Pope's Supremacy.'

Here, in like manner as before, in his Answer to my other Propositions, this Gentleman is pleas'd to make use of an Argument, which is evidently *fallacious*, both in the Premises and Conclusion: For, as to his *Major*, it appears plainly, that a Nation might be in Communion with the Church, in the first five Centuries, without acknowledging the Pope's Supremacy; as I have plainly prov'd in the foregoing Parts of these Remarks. And, as to the *Minor*, that *this Nation, in particular, was so*, is put out of

of question, by his own Concession, that *her Representatives were universally received at the Councils* above-nam'd. But, whether this acute *Logician*, who lays so much Stress upon this Argument, has more expos'd himself to the Censure of Ignorance or Insincerity, I leave to the ingenuous and unprejudiced to determine, upon this true Report of the Case.

THE Council of ARLES is (even by *Cabbasutius* himself) confess'd to have been convened by the Command of the EMPEROR *Constantine* the Great, *A. D.* 314, (eleven Years before that of *Nice*) and on this Occasion: The *Donatists* having form'd a grievous Schism in the *African Church*, had been condemn'd for it in a Council held at *Rome*, *A. D.* 313, by the same Emperor's Order, who was pleas'd to refer the Cause to be examin'd, by way of Delegation, to *Melchiades*, the then Pope, and three *French Bishops* as his COLLEGUES: But the Schismatics still persisting in their Complaints of Injuries, and appealing from thence to the Emperor, he commanded a Rehearing of the same in this Council at *Arles*, notwithstanding the former Sentence of the Pope and his Assessors. And here *Marinus*, the Bishop of the Place, was the President, tho' the then Pope (*Sylvester*) had his Proxies there, assenting to their Resolutions against the Schismatics. After which, the holy Fathers notified what they had done, in their Synodical Epistle to their most holy Lord, and dear Brother *Sylvester the Bishop*, (as they familiarly style the

F 2

Pope;)

Pope;) intimating withal, that they expected he should make their Decrees and Canons publicly known throughout his large Diocese, (*Labb. p. 1434. Bin. p. 223. col. 2.*) And particularly, they gave him express **ORDERS**, to give Notice, according to Custom, to all under his Jurisdiction, of what they had decreed about the uniform Observation of the *Easter Festival*, (*Can. 1.*) From all which, 'tis evident, how little Authority there is for pretending to ground any *Acknowledgment* of the Papal Supremacy upon the Proceedings of this Council.

Nor is the Council of **SARDICA** more pertinently referr'd to, in the same Question, which was also called, not by the Pope's Authority, but by that of the **EMPERORS** *Constantius* and *Constans*, at the Request of Pope *Julius*, in order to determine the great Controversy between *Athanasius* and the *Arians* who had unjustly censur'd, and uncanonically depos'd him. For, after both Parties had, by Consent, referr'd that Matter to *Julius's* Approbation, (as *Baronius* himself confesseth, *Ann. 340. n. 2.*) *Athanasius* came to *Rome*; though not in regard of any acknowledg'd Supremacy there, but merely as being the Place then by themselves agreed on for that particular Reference. But, so far were his Adversaries from submitting to the Pope's Award in his Favour, that they would neither restore the injur'd Prelate to his Church, nor admit him to Communion upon it.

Where-

Whereupon *Julius* made an heavy Complaint to the Emperor *Constans*; which engag'd him to write to his Brother *Constantius* about the same. Yet, this Application from the Pope did not prove effectual: But it was the personal Address of *Athanasius* himself, and *Paul* of *Constantinople*, which procured the Orders from both the Emperors, for the Convening of this Council, in 347; as is affirm'd by *Sozomen*, *Socrates*, and *Theodoret*, and acknowledg'd by the Bishops themselves, in their Synodical Epistle, (*Labb. To. ii. p. 670.*) And, though it was intended for a General Council; yet, so few of the Bishops came to it, and those so ill agreed, that the Eastern Bishops (most of whom were prejudiced in favour of the *Arians*) generally withdrew themselves into a separate Assembly at *Philippopolis*; so that the Fathers at *Sardica* retained only the Authority of a Western Council. And as to the Presidency there, *Sozomen* (L. iii. c. 11.) informs us, that *Hosius* and *Protogenes* were the *Chief*: That is, the former presiding as an ancient and famous Confessor, and the latter as Bishop of the Place; and both of them subscribing in their own Names, not as the Pope's Legates. In short, so far was any Papal Supremacy from being universally acknowledg'd in those Days, that the Eastern Bishops did not only, with great Freedom, expostulate with *Julius* upon his Proceedings, and slight his Authority, but actually EXCOMMUNICATED HIS HOLINESS himself, together with the other Heads of the

Party which had oppos'd their Measures! And those of the West, at the End of this Council, style him only THEIR BROTHER AND FELLOW-BISHOP, and desire him (not to confirm, but) to *notify their Decrees* to their Brethren in his Neighbourhood, (*Labb. To. ii. p. 626.*) But, Besides many other Conclusions which might be fairly drawn from hence, against the pretended Supremacy, the very Occasion of this their Synodical Assembly, doth sufficiently shew the Absurdity of such a Claim; their Business being here purposely to re-examine and determine a Cause which had been already judg'd by the Pope himself and his *Roman Council*, but was now brought to a Re-hearing by way of Appeal to the Emperor, at the Pope's own Instance!

And as to that other Council at ARIMINUM, *A. D. 359*, (which is also cited here, in favour of the Papal Supremacy) 'tis agreed, on all Hands, to have been call'd by the EMPEROR *Constantius's* Authority, (*Sulp. Sev. Hist. l. 2.*) who moreover commanded the Bishops there assembled to send him their Decrees, for HIS CONFIRMATION, (*Labb. p. 794. Bin. p. 482. col. 2.*) Which tho' *Baronius* censures, as the Act of an Heretical Emperor, yet the Orthodox Bishops readily observed his Order, and call'd it the *Obeying the Command of God, and his pious Edict*, (*Baron. Ann. 359, n. 6. and n. 15.*) However, we may from hence observe, That, as this Emperor was liable to the Censure of Heresy, so was also *Liberius*, the then Pope,

Pope, as is testified by St. *Athanasius*, St. *Hilary*, and St. *Jerome*, (Not. ad 7. Ep. *Liber. Labb.* p. 751. *Bin.* p. 470. col. 1. & *Spalat.* de Repub. Eccl. l. vii. c. 5.) and confess'd (among others) by *Platina*, (in vitâ *Liberii*, p. 50.) Therefore, 'tis the more remarkable, that such an Emperor should overlook such a Pope (of his own Opinion) in the Calling of a Council, if he had entertain'd the least Notion of any such Papal Supremacy as is now pretended: However, it does not appear, by any credible Voucher, that the Pope was either present, in Person, or by Proxy, at this Council, or any way concern'd in the calling it; and much less, that the being received as Members thereof must necessarily infer an *Acknowledgment* of his Supremacy. Yet,

SUCH are the Proofs, upon which this Gentleman pretends to ground his Argument, to persuade his credulous Followers, that, because *this Nation was in Communion with the Church in the first five Centuries, therefore she did acknowledge the Pope's Supremacy!* The contrary of which is true; as I have fairly shew'd, even from these his own select Instances. But, I may further CHALLENGE him to prove, from any authentic Vouchers, that those who were in Communion with the Church in those primitive Ages, did ever *acknowledge* such a Supremacy as he contends for. This, however, is demonstrable from our own Records, That, when *Austin*, the Monk, came hither from *Rome* (near 600 Years after *Christ*) to forward

the Conversion of the Heathen Saxons, the *British* Bishops, who met him at a Conference, strenuously asserted the Independency of the *British* Church; declaring, that, though they owed *Brotherly* Kindness and Charity to the Bishop of *Rome*, and all *Christians*, they knew no other *Obedience* to be due from them to him who was call'd *the Pope*; they being under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*, who, under God, was their proper Metropolitan and Spiritual Director, (*Spelm. Conc.* V. i. p. 108. and *Leland* de Scriptor. in *Dinotb.*) How the several Popes, afterwards, work'd themselves into the actual Possession of such a Power, is beyond the Bounds of our present Inquiry. This must, nevertheless, be well observed, That, in order to the Reformation of this Church, and the Recovery of its ancient Freedom, it was a Principle, openly profess'd, and well maintain'd, by the then College of Bishops in Synod, as well as by the most eminent and learned of them in their respective Sermons, Writings, Subscriptions, and Oaths, seconded also by the public Resolutions of our own, and many other, famous Universities, That *the Bishop of Rome hath NO MORE AUTHORITY, of Divine Right, in the Kingdom of England, than any other foreign Bishop hath.* And, to obviate, all pretence of Prejudice or Partiality, it must be remember'd, that this was the authentic Doctrine and Testimony of GARDINER, BONNER, TUNSTAL, and the rest, who were all far enough from the least Suspicion

Suspicion of any Byas towards the Reformation.

BUT I must not be so rude, as to pass without taking notice of his genteel Transition to what follows; where he says, ' Sir, Thus ' having fairly answer'd, without any Quib- ' bling, four of your Propositions, I shall now ' begin with your Fifth, also with some small ' Remarks on your Priesthood.'

Upon which he is pleas'd to bestow many Compliments, in his obliging Way; though he does not come close to the Point propos'd. But I shall attend him, in his own Method, Paragraph by Paragraph.

' The Sum (*says he*) of your 5th Proposition is, that the Errors and Heresies, that ' have sprung up, within these two Hundred ' Years, came from the Church of *Rome*, and ' not from the Church of *England*; which ' you ought to have proved, either from some ' Doctrine in general, or particular, that the ' Church of *Rome* believeth, or teacheth; which ' you can never do.'

HERE this Gentleman (according to the common Artifice of such Disputants) would fain lead me aside from the main Question, by starting fresh Game for me to pursue beyond the Bounds propos'd. And, indeed, it would not be so difficult as he pretends, for me to *prove some Doctrines that the Church of Rome believeth or teacheth*, from whence the modern SECTARIES had deriv'd the Errors and Heresies now controverted among us: For the Proof
of

of which the *Councils* and *Fathers* (even some of those whom he himself has partially cited) would afford me store of Evidence, if it were now my Business. But, (as I observ'd at first) *it will not (nor can) be necessary to enter into the more particular Points in Controversy 'till those few Propositions (which I had laid down) were previously adjusted*; the fifth and last of which was this: 'That the Errors or Heresies of the
'several Sects, commonly comprehended under
'the general Denomination of PROTESTANTS,
'cannot, so fairly, be charg'd upon the true
'Church of *England*, as upon the Church of
'*Rome*, from whence they sprang.'

Now, he must excuse me, that I do not think myself bound by his magisterial Dictate, as to what I *ought to prove*: But I shall make good my own Proposition, by the most unexceptionable of all Arguments, even undeniable Matter of FACT.

IN the Beginning of the Reign of our Queen *Elizabeth*, 'tis well known, that the Papists resorted to the Church of *England*, as it was then reform'd. But, when the Politicians of the Court of *Rome* found, that all their Arguments and Insinuations were too weak to overturn the well-grounded Reformation here, and to reduce this Nation to the Pope's Subjection, they had recourse to more subtle Artifices, as well as to open Threatnings and Fulminations. Among the rest, one of their most hopeful Projects was, by raising various Sects and SEPARATIONS, to divide us among ourselves, and distract the
Minds

Minds of the People in Matters of Religion, that so they might the more easily alienate them from our establish'd Church, and seduce them to that of *Rome*: And how successfully they have pursu'd this their wicked Scheme, and improv'd the PIOUS FRAUD, is evident to all judicious Observers, from the many various Sects of *Dissenting Novelists* daily starting up, and the Multitudes of unwary *Apostates*, discover'd every where.

BUT, that this is not a general Charge, and without good Grounds, I shall lay before the Reader a Specimen of authentic Proofs, in the following particular Instances:

In the Year 1567, one FAITHFUL COMMUN, who was then generally reputed a zealous PROTESTANT, and of seeming extraordinary Piety, distinguish'd himself much to the Liking of his giddy and simple Followers, at first, by his bitter Railing against the *Pope and Popery*; 'till, by degrees, he fill'd them with Prejudices also against our Common-Prayer, as if it were only the *Mass in English*! At the same Time, by his own Affectation, he possess'd them with a fond Admiration of preaching and praying EXTEMPORE, under pretence of extraordinary Gifts of the *Spirit*; thereby seducing the unwary People, through a false Notion of TENDER CONSCIENCE, into a dangerous *Schism*, and opening a Way to divers other erroneous and heretical Tenets, purposely propagated to the same wicked End! Yet, after all, this pretended *Protestant* Zealot, upon
due

due Examination, was discover'd to be a DOMINICAN FRIER: Whom the Pope himself did not only approve, but liberally reward, for such his detestable Prevarication. (Lord Cecil's Memoirs.)

In the very next Year, one THOMAS HEATH, who had preached about the Country, upwards of six Years, in the Character of a poor Minister, being permitted, by the Dean of Rochester, to preach before him in the Cathedral there, gave just Cause of Suspicion that he was an IMPOSTOR: And, upon Examination, he was openly convicted (and confess'd himself) to be a JESUIT, who had made it his Business also to persuade the People, that our Episcopacy, Liturgy and Ceremonies, were *Popish*; and under pretence of a PURER REFORMATION, laboured to promote *schismatical* Separations from our Establish'd Church. Among his Papers were found a LICENCE from the Society of *Jesuits*, and a Bull from Pope Pius V. whereby 'twas discover'd, that he, and the rest of their Missionaries, were authoriz'd, occasionally, to preach and propagate whatever Principles they should think most fit for their Purpose; it being a Maxim, among their Politicians, that the only Way to recover the People to (what they call) their *Mother Church*, was by puzzling their Understanding with Diversity of Doctrines: And to this Purpose, they had furnish'd Heath with several Books against *Infant-Baptism*, together with Variety of other hete-

heterodox Principles and horrid Blasphemies.
(Register of the Church of *Rochester*.)

From the same Source sprang the rebellious Commotions of the COVENANTERS in *Scotland*, and the rest of the Sects in *England*, fomented by *Con*, the Pope's Legate, and *Chamberlain*, the Cardinal *Richlieu*'s Chaplain and Almoner, though under the specious Pretext of guarding against *Popery*! Hence arose the several Subdivisions of Non-conforming *Prsbyterians*, *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, *Fifth-monarchy-men*, *Quakers*, &c. of which last Sect, in particular, we are credibly inform'd, that the Society of *Jesuits* were twenty Years in hammering it out to their Purpose. (*Foxes and Firebr.* 1682.)

THUS have I fairly made good all my own Propositions, not by any *Quibbling*, or *fallacious* Sophistry, but by authentic Matters of Fact, and fair Arguments; all which I submit to the candid and impartial Reader's Judgment. If the Gentleman thinks fit to except against the Authority here cited, for the Truth of the Facts last mention'd, I may safely appeal even to his own *Conscience*, whether he does not know, or has sufficient Reason to believe, that some of the Emissaries of *Rome* have occasionally PERSONATED PROTESTANTS, and, under that general Denomination and Disguise, propagated Errors and Heresies among the Sectaries, which are abhorrent to the true Church of *England*, though they unfairly, and fallaciously, endeavour to persuade their too credulous Profelytes,
to

to charge the same upon all who are call'd *Protestants*, without distinction.

' But (*says he*) we can prove a Doctrine, ' believed and taught by the Church of *Eng-* ' *land*, that has open'd a wide Gap for all He- ' resy, nay, and Infidelity. For, what else can ' be expected, when your 11th Article, unto ' which you all swear and subscribe, in your pre- ' tended Ordination, says, that not by Works, ' but by Faith (only) a Man is justified? If ' so, then there's no Necessity, for feeding the ' Hungry, cloathing the Naked, or visiting the ' Sick, and those that are in Prison; altho' our ' Blessed Saviour has pronounced Damnation ' on the contrary. *St. Paul* adds, If a Man ' has Faith, even to remove Mountains, and ' has not Charity, it availeth nothing; (then ' Faith only will not suffice.) I would add, *St.* ' *James*; (but to him you give the Lye) who ' says, that not by Faith only, but by Works, a ' Man is justified: Whereas you say, by Faith ' only; therefore, at the least, your Doctrine ' tends to Infidelity.'

HERE again (as I observed before) the Gentle- man endeavours to divert me to other Questions foreign to our present Debate. He is conscious, how many Points of *Doctrine* are taught in their Church, and establish'd by their last pre- tended General Council, to be believed, as Articles of Faith, under Pain of DAMNATION, though neither warranted by the Word of God, nor the Evidence of true primitive Antiquity. He therefore begins artfully, by way of Pre-
vention,

vention, to raise a Dust of fresh Controversy; thereby hoping to turn the Tables upon us, and persuade his unwary Followers, to forsake the Communion of *our Church*, and revolt to *theirs*, without duly considering the essential Difference, or apprehending the Danger.

But, though I might reasonably decline the following such a self-interested and deceitful Guide beyond the Bounds at first proposed; yet, being sensible, how apt such Men, as I have here to deal with, are, to magnify every Thing they alledge, (how trifling or impertinent soever,) as authentic and unanswerable, I shall not scruple to bestow a little more Time and Pains on a few short Strictures upon this, and the remaining Passages, before I take my Leave of him. And,

I. As to what he objects against the Doctrine of our Church, that *we are Justified by Faith only*, 'tis evident, he has either not read our ARTICLES himself, or presumes upon the implicate Faith of his Adherents, that they will depend upon his bare Word, more than upon their own Senses: Else, (if they were allow'd to read) they might plainly see, how NECESSARY GOOD WORKS are declar'd to be, as the *Fruit of a lively Faith*: And we are so far from denying the Necessity of *feeding the Hungry*, &c. that we hold and believe them to be *pleasing and acceptable to God, in Christ*, though we disclaim the pretended MERIT of *our own Works and Deservings*, and especially the Popish Doctrine of *Supererogation*. (Art.

xi, xii, xiii, xiv.) And, how easily St. *Paul* and St. *James* may be reconciled, in this Point, without *giving the Lye* (as this polite Gentleman expresseth it) *to either*, is clearly demonstrated by the *English Divines*, and particularly among the Sermons of Bishop *Blackall*, to which I refer the Reader, for ample Satisfaction.

2. Though our Church holds this to be *a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort*, she does not peremptorily impose it upon others (as the Church of *Rome* does her many controverted Novelties) under Pain of DAMNATION: So that, even they who will suppose it to be an *Error*, cannot rationally suspect it of *opening a wide Gap for Heresy*, since it is not obstinately persisted in, or insisted upon. But, how the building so much upon FAITH ONLY can be call'd *a Doctrine tending to INFIDELITY*, is beyond the Compass of Common Sense and Reason to comprehend!

‘As to your 20th and 21st Articles, (*says he*) they teach, that your Church, in Controversies of Faith, has an Authority; but it's a fallible one. If so; then every Man is a Judge for himself; from whence it is, that all these Sectaries sprang: For, every Man's private Judgment is fallible; and, of consequence, no infallible Certainty what to believe.’

Now, here we must observe, 1. That what our Church holds, as to *Authority in Controversies of Faith*, is not singular, or peculiar to herself. Though she modestly does not pretend to be Infallible, 'tis no more than she declares
of

of all other Parts of the Catholic Church, *viz.* That they *have erred, not only in their Living and Manner of Ceremonies, but also in Matters of Faith*, (Art. xix.) But this, I suppose, would not have given such Offence to this captious Gentleman, if the CHURCH OF ROME had not been mention'd, expressly and by Name, among the rest, as she, and she alone, pretends to INFALLIBILITY; though, for any such Distinction of Privilege, we have nothing but her own bold Word, contrary to all other Authority, Divine and Human, and the plain Evidence also of incontestable Facts. And, moreover, he is, undoubtedly, gall'd (though he does not speak it out) at what our Church declares against the *ordaining any Thing that is CONTRARY TO GOD'S WORD WRITTEN; or the so expounding one Place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another*, (Art. xx.) as well as what is said also of the *Authority of GENERAL COUNCILS*. But, as to these, the Reason given for their being FALLIBLE, will not admit of any Controversy, *Forasmuch as they be an Assembly of Men, whereof ALL be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God*, from whence it follows, that *they may, and sometimes have erred, even in Things pertaining unto God*, (Art. xxi.)

2. That the Conclusions pretended to be drawn from hence, are as fallacious as his other Arguments. For, here he would fain persuade his credulous Disciples, that he has caught us fast in a *Dilemma* ! But, we are not under a Ne-

cessity, either to acknowledge any such infallible *Authority in the Church*, as he pleads for ; or to allow, that *every Man is a JUDGE FOR HIMSELF* : So that the Source, *from whence all these SECTARIES sprung*, will be sought in-vain amongst any of the genuine Principles of our Church ; though they may easily be discover'd from the *political Conclave* herein before pointed out, and referr'd to.

We know, of **INFALLIBLE CERTAINTY**, that *Christ* himself hath left us an infallible Rule of Faith in the *Holy Scripture* ; which (we believe) *containeth all Things necessary to Salvation*, (Art. vi.) We firmly and stedfastly believe the *Scripture*, and the *three Creeds*, in the declar'd Sense of the Primitive Church : We receive the *first four General Councils*, as of the highest Authority among the Ancients : And we believe all the Points of *Doctrine* also which were generally received as *Fundamental* in the Church of *Christ*. At the same Time, we are so far from giving way to any *private Man* to be *Judge* of General Councils, or Controversies of Faith, that we do not allow it, even in the *Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church*, which be not repugnant to the *Word of God*, and be ordained and approved by common Authority ; but, our Church declares, that *whosoever, thro' his PRIVATE JUDGMENT, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the same, ought to be rebuked openly*, (Art. xxxiv.) And, as *every Man's private Judgment* is here truly said to be *fallible*, the Church of Rome can have no cer-
tain

tain Privilege of Exemption from the same ; at least, 'till they be well agreed among themselves, where their pretended Infallibility is to be found, (whether personally in the *Pope* himself, or representatively in a *General Council*, or jointly in both together ;) and of consequence, no infallible Certainty what to believe, in their Church ; whereas, we have a most infallible Certainty of it in ours, that is, of the Foundations of it, in the *Holy Scripture* and the *Creed*.

AND now, I come to the last Compliment, which this obliging Gentleman is pleas'd to pay me, as followeth :

Now, Sir, (*says he*) I humbly presume, I have sufficiently answer'd your five Propositions ; and, according to my Promise, make some Remarks on your Priesthood. My Observation thus,

That these Words, Priest, Altar and Sacrifice, are Correlatives. For, the Word, Priest, absolutely presupposeth Altar and Sacrifice, as the Word, Father, presupposeth a Child, or Children ; for, the one is absolutely necessary to constitute the other. This being premised, (*says he*)

I ask this Question, Where is your Altar and Sacrifice ? Sometimes, indeed, you call your Communion-Table Altar : But then, where is your Sacrifice, when you acknowledge no other, than that which was once offer'd on the Cross upon Mount *Calvary*. If so, I would advise you, not to assume that sacred Character, to which you can claim

' no Right, for want of Ordination, Altar, and
' Sacrifice.'

Behold here, a *great Shew* of Arguments, which might be branch'd out into many particular Questions; yet *no Substance* of any one, but what has been, over and over again, fully answer'd and fairly confuted, by such of the learned Divines of the Church of *England* as have professedly undertaken to expose the several notorious Fallacies formerly invented, and here repeated in this Objection. If this Gentleman does *not know* of any such Answers already publish'd, his IGNORANCE may be pitied! If he *will* not give them a fair and impartial Reading, his PREJUDICE entitles him only to Contempt. But that he, and his Followers, may be left without Excuse hereafter, if they persist in repeating the same groundless Calumnies, and wilfully shut their Eyes against the evident Means of Conviction, I shall content myself with pointing out (to those who have Candour and Ingenuity enough to face and own the Truth) some of the many learned Authors, whose known Works may well spare me the Pains of following an *Ignis fatuus*, farther than I am particularly concern'd, in the Support of my own Propositions.

Let then the sensible and unbiass'd Inquirer bestow but a serious Perusal upon the Books here referr'd to, *viz.*

Dr. HEYLIN's *Antidotum Lincolnienſe*, 1637, in 4to.

His *Coal from the Altar*, 1637, in 4to. and
His

His Miscellaneous Tracts, 1681, in Folio.

Dr. POCKLINGTON's *Altare Christianum*, 1637, in 4to.

Archbishop LAUD's Speech in the *Star-Chamber*, 1637, in 4to. and

His Conference with *Fisher*, 1639, in Folio.

Archbishop BRAMHALL's Works, 1677, in Folio.

Bishop BURNET's Vindication of our Ordinations, 1677, in 8vo.

Dr. PRIDEAUX's Validity of the same, 1688, in 4to.

Archbishop POTTER's Discourse of Church-Government, 1711, in 8vo.

Dr. HICKES's two Treatises of the Christian Priesthood, &c. 1711, in 8vo.

Dr. BRETT's Sermon of the Christian Altar and Sacrifice, 1713, in 8vo.

Mr. JOHNSON's Unbloody Sacrifice, &c. 1718, in 8vo.

Bishop SPARROW's Rationale, 1722, in 8vo. and

Mr. FRANCIS MASON's Vindication of the Church of *England*, 1728, in Folio.

(Besides several others, none of which have been answer'd and refuted to this Day :) And I may confidently affirm, there will not remain any good Cause of Doubt, or reason to ask of us such an impertinent Question, as *Where is our ALTAR AND SACRIFICE?* or for us to pay the least Regard to this learned Gentleman's sage *Advice* or Opinion of any of the Circum-

Circumstances relating to our ORDINATION AND PRIESTHOOD.

BUT now, as a Parting-Blow in the Conclusion of all, he flourisheth his Pen, in Triumph, as if he had incontestable Proofs, more than enough, to confound us, even out of our *own Histories*.

‘ As for your Ordination, (*says he*) your own Histories prove, your Church never had any. One Instance shall suffice, instead of many that might be cited. When BONNER, Bishop of *London*, was Prisoner in the *Clink*, HORN’s Chancellor tender’d the Oath of Supremacy : On the Refusal he was indicted at the *King’s-Bench*. Bishop *Bonner* pleaded, that *Horn* was No Bishop. The Cause came before the Judges : And the Judges gave it in favour of *Bonner*. [Dr. *Heylin* on the 8th of *Eliz.* 1565, 1566.] From whence it’s plain, that *Horn* had no legal Ordination ; for, if he had, he would have brought the Certificate, and not left it to twelve Judges.’

All this he confidently affirms, as undoubted Matter of Fact ; for which he boldly cites Dr. *Heylin* as a Witness : For, he has had frequent Experience, with what IMPLICIT FAITH, the Followers of such Guides are apt to rely upon whatsoever is dictated by their *infallible Oracles*, without giving themselves the Trouble, (and perhaps not permitted by their Superiors) to read, and judge for themselves, whether or no the Authorities they vouch are fairly cited. Otherwise, surely, no Man, who has any Regard

gard for his Character, would presume to risque it, by falsifying, and notoriously misreporting, *our own Histories*, or other Books, which are so easily produced to disprove them. As for Dr. HEYLIN, he is indeed one of *our own Historians*, and an Author so far above Exception, that we may freely JOIN ISSUE, and rest this, and all other controverted Points, UPON HIS TESTIMONY: But, let us see what he is here call'd to prove; and examine, whether his Evidence comes up to the Point in issue.

Now the Question proposed is, That *the Church of England NEVER HAD ANY Ordination*. And what is the Proof of this? Why, truly, he endeavours to suborn Dr. Heylin to prove, that HORN (Bishop of Winchester) *had NO LEGAL Ordination!* From which single and *particular Instance* (supposing it to be true) none, but such a *Logician* as this, could think it consistent with Reason and Common Sense, to conclude in *general*, that *our Church never had any*. And yet, this *one*, is the only *Instance*, which he is able to make a Shew of, out of the *many that* (he pretends) *might be cited*.

As to BONNER'S Case, what he says of the *Tender and Refusal of the Oath*, the *Indictment* thereupon, and the *Plea*, is so far a Truth; yet not the whole Truth: But what he has added, of *the Cause coming before the Judges*, and the JUDGES GIVING it in favour of Bonner, is all a gross Misrepresentation of the Case, and an Abuse both of his Author and Reader. For,

Dr. *Heylin* has fairly related, with what Favour *Bonner* was treated by the Judges of that Court, who readily assign'd him his Choice of the most eminent Council, to enable him to make the best of his Defence: That, by their Advice, he first offer'd a Plea in Abatement, that he was not indicted by the Stile and Title of a Bishop, though he was actually and legally (as he insisted) Bishop of *London*; which the Court did not allow to be a good Plea: And then he pleaded, that *Horn* was not Bishop of *Winchester*, and therefore not authoris'd, by the Statute upon which he was indicted, to tender him the Oath. Now, the Question was not, whether *Horn* ever had ANY Consecration; but turn'd upon a single Point of Law, whether or no THE FORM, by which he was consecrated, (and of which, by the by, *Bonner* himself had been one of the Compilers in King *Edward's* Time) having been repeal'd by Queen *Mary*, was LEGALLY reviv'd and re-establish'd, at or before the Time of *Horn's* Consecration. And after several Arguments thereon at Bar, it came to be debated among the twelve Judges; by whom it was put upon Issue, and the Fact agreed to be tried by a Jury of the County of *Surry*, where the first Process began. But none of *Bonner's* Council were so cunning (as his Advocate here seems to think himself) to urge, that if *Horn* had had a legal Ordination, he would have brought the Certificate, and not left it to twelve Judges!

This, however, was the Proceeding which the Gentleman represents, as if *the Judges* had *given the Cause in favour of Bonner*! Whereas, 'tis certain, the Issue never came to a Trial, NOR DID THE JUDGES GIVE ANY JUDGMENT in favour of either Party. For, considering the great Importance of the Case, and the Insufficiency or Partiality of some Juries in those Times, the Wisdom of the Nation in Parliament assembled thought it proper to take the Matter into their own Cognizance.

And here it was solemnly DECLARED and attested, by the whole Legislature, 1. That the *slandrous Speeches* upon the making and consecrating of Bishops, &c. had grown up, by *overmuch Boldness* among the common Sort of UNLEARNED PEOPLE, much tending to the SLANDER of one of the greatest States of this Realm; which evil Speech is NOT GROUNDED UPON ANY JUST MATTER OR CAUSE. 2. That the Form authorised for the consecrating and ordaining of the Bishops and other Clergy, was *added and put to* the Book of Common-Prayer, and annexed to the same, (*viz.* by the Statute 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. 1. § 5.) 3. That *it is, and may be, very evident and apparent, that NO CAUSE of Scruple, Ambiguity or Doubt, can, or may, JUSTLY BE OBJECTED; — but that EVERY THING requisite and material for that Purpose, hath been made and done, as precisely, and with as great Care and Diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before, AS THE RECORDS will more plainly testify,*

H

And

And therefore, 4. *All the Acts and Things done in and about any Consecration, &c. since the Beginning of her Majesty's Reign, are declared, judged and deemed GOOD AND PERFECT, to all Respects and Purposes, &c. (Stat. 8 Eliz. c. 1.)* Upon which Dr. Heylin observes, 1. That if the Form of Consecration, &c. was not restor'd, in Terms significant and express, together with the Book of Common-Prayer, as a Member of it, or, at least, an Appendant to it, it was but *Casus omissus*, being restor'd INTENTIONALLY, at least, if not in Terminis, as plainly appears by this very Statute: And, 2. That though all farther Proceedings against the Recusants were stopp'd for a Time specified, yet that was no Determination of *the Judges* in favour of Bonner, but rather, a meer ACT OF GRACE or Indulgence of the whole Legislature, (as Heylin himself expresseth it); *to them of the Laity, in hope of gaining them, by fair Means, to a Sense of their Duty; to Bonner, and the rest of the Bishops, as Men who had sufficiently suffer'd upon that Account, by the Loss of their Bishopricks.*

This is all that was done in that Case; *from whence* the impartial Reader may judge for himself, whether *it's plain, that Horn had no legal Ordination*, (as this Gentleman would infer;) and consequently, that *our Church never had any!* But, there is good Reason to doubt, whether those who study thus to revive and propagate stale Objections, and notorious Slanders, which have been so often answer'd, and
plainly

plainly detected, are entitled to the Plea of *Ignorance*, in excuse of *Malice*, while they thus audaciously presume to falsify, and give the *LYE* to the solemn Testimony of the *Sovereign and all the Three Estates* of the Realm, united in a full and lawful Parliament, as well as to the other authentic *Records* of both our Church and State.

However, this may be evident, to all who diligently search for Truth, that, supposing (but for Argument-sake only) that the Consecration of *Horn*, and his Brethren, at that Time, had been defective in some particular Circumstance, or *Punctilio* of Law, yet it would not follow, that *our Church never had any*: For, it is a known Rule, that every casual Breach of a Law or Canon doth not cause a Nullity in Ordinations. And we have superabundant Proofs of a regular Succession of the Episcopal Order continued down to our Days, through the Hands of several Bishops of other National Churches (never yet pretended to have been disputed) who heartily concur'd, and actually join'd, with our Bishops, in the Consecration of those from whom our Clergy derive their respective Characters, by a regular, valid, and legal Ordination; as hath been fairly demonstrated (among many other material Points relating to the present Controversy) in the *Preface* to the last Edition of MASON's *Vindication of our Church*, herein-before referr'd to.